DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 574 HE 018 584

AUTHOR Rice, R. Eugene
TITLE Faculty Lives: Vitality and Change. A Study of the Foundation's Grants in Faculty Development, 1979-1984. A Northwest Area Foundation Report.
INSTITUTION Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 83p.
AVAILABLE FROM Northwest Area Foundation, West 975 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, MN 55101-1373 (free).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Students; *Career Change; *College Faculty; Consortia; Continuing Education; *Faculty Development; Grants; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; International Education; Liberal Arts; Personnel Policy; *Philanthropic Foundations; Regional Cooperation; *Retrenchment; Statewide Planning; Teacher Morale; Teacher Workshops; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Northwest Area Foundation MN

ABSTRACT

Faculty development projects funded by the Northwest Area Foundation are described. While some projects addressed retrenchment and the nature and structure of academic careers, others involved multi-institutional strategies. Types of projects and institutions are: new teaching and administrative competencies (College of Saint Scholastica, Mary College, Montana University System); preparing faculty to teach adults (Colleges of Mid-America, Marylhurst College for Lifelong Learning, Linfield College); career planning and professional growth contracts (Linfield College, Mount Mercy College); college planning and organizational development (Concordia College); alternative careers exploration (Council of Independent Colleges, University of Puget Sound); faculty development through statewide systems (Montana University System, North Dakota Board of Higher Education); regional consortia (Southwest West Central Consortium, Minnesota); faculty development through public/private cooperation (Winona Tri-College, University Consortium, Minnesota); Iowa Liberal Arts Project; and scholarship and faculty vitality (Carleton College and Saint Olaf College International Studies Project, Minnesota). Project contact persons and external evaluators are identified, and current faculty development resource materials are briefly described. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261574

A

NORTHWEST AREA FOUNDATION

HIGHER EDUCATION

REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Northwest Area Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Faculty Lives: Vitality and Change

HEMP SRM

orthwest Area Foundation was established in 1934 by Louis W. Hill, Senior, son of James J. Hill, pioneer builder of the Great Northern Railway. Originally called the Lexington Foundation, then the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation, its name was changed to Northwest Area Foundation in 1975 to reflect its growth and its commitment to the region that provided its original resources.

The Foundation makes grants in Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. It concentrates on the arts, education, environmental and physical sciences, human services, medical sciences and health, and the social sciences.

Faculty Lives: Vitality and Change

A Study of the Foundation's Grants in Faculty Development, 1979–1984

R. Eugene Rice
Consultant to the Foundation
Professor of Sociology
University of the Pacific

A NORTHWEST AREA FOUNDATION REPORT

1985

West 975 First National Bank Building

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101-1373 · (612) 224-9635

Material from this report
may be used or reprinted
without permission
as long as Northwest Area Foundation
is credited as its source.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD 5
INTRODUCTION 9
STRATEGIES FOR MAINTAINING
FACULTY VITALITY: THE FOUNDATION'S PROJECTS 14
New Approaches to Academic Career Development 15
Providing New Academic Roles 16
Career Planning and Professional Growth Contracts 22
Organizational Development and Institutional Planning 24
Exploration of Alternative Careers 25
Multi-Institutional Approaches 28
Faculty Development Through State-Wide Systems 29
A Regional Consortium Approach 35
Faculty Development Through Public/Private Cooperation 36
Focus on the Liberal Arts 39
Scholarship and the Maintenance of Faculty Vitality 40
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT — FROM PERIPHERY
TO THE CENTER: A CONCLUDING ESSAY 42
Being Professional Academically 43
Faculty Renewal and Student Development 46
Relating to the External World of Work 47
The Link to Academic Planning and Institutional Policies 49
Final Observations 50
THE EVALUATION PROCESS 57
ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION 59
RESOURCES 74
OVERVIEW OF THE FOUNDATION'S HIGHER
EDUCATION PROGRAM 77

FOREWORD

In the mid-1970s, demographers and educators began talking about the effects that the declining birth rate would have on higher education. It was predicted that the number of students graduating from high school would diminish by 32 percent by the mid-1980s. A number of forecasters were saying that nearly all colleges and universities would experience an enrollment drop between 25 and 35 percent, depending upon their location, academic quality, tuition costs, and degree of selectivity. The Foundation's faculty development program, initiated in 1978, was based primarily on the conclusions drawn from the above projection. It was believed that most institutions would suffer severe financial losses or cutbacks because of the high level of fixed costs inherent in operating a labor intensive activity. Younger, untenured faculty would be in great jeopardy due to the fact that many of the colleges would be "tenured in" at 80 percent or more, and secondly, the change of the mandatory retirement age from sixty-five to seventy would increase the number of protected faculty positions. In 1978, one half of all tenured faculty were under the age of forty, which suggested that there would be little, if any, "new blood" coming into colleges for the next thirty years. The fundamental question facing institutions of higher education was how to provide quality education in an era of declining enrollment when two of the traditional modes of revitalization (job mobility between colleges and entry of young faculty) would be almost non-existent.

With a commitment to quality higher education in its region, the Foundation believed that if it could support programs to increase the vitality of faculty, it would consequently improve the quality of the institutions. Faculty, as the facilitators of learning, are an institu-

tion's most valuable resource. At the time the proposed grant program to support faculty vitality was presented to the Foundation's Directors, few other foundations were funding such activities. In addition, faculty morale was beginning to decline. Dollars were becoming scarce and faculty were beginning to feel "stuck" in their jobs.

A Request for Proposals announced the Foundation's interest in "maintaining the vitality of faculties in a period of retrenchment and enrollment decline." The way in which an institution addressed this problem was left to the applicant. However, the Foundation suggested several areas, which included: revision of personnel policies governing tenure and promotion, retirement, pension practices, and incentive-pay systems; career change options for faculty who wished to develop new professional roles either outside academia or within; support systems for faculty facing termination; exchange of faculty with other institutions; respecialization in new or related subjects or teaching new types of students. Applicants could request support spanning one to three years. Up to $800,000 was to be made available for the first round of grants. In April 1979 nine grants were approved, totaling $790,001. They addressed a number of strategies which are described in this booklet.

After reading the fifty proposals submitted for this program, staff recommended that future faculty vitality grants be made on a system-wide or a consortium basis. It was felt that there are definite economies of scale in such an approach. For example, one of the activities commonly proposed in the grant proposals had to do with faculty seminars explaining career options, opportunities, and outplacement activities. Providing these services to fifty to one hundred participants might cost less on a per capita basis than providing the service to five or ten faculty. The Directors agreed that the second round of grants should be awarded to multiple rather than individual institutions. In October 1979, a Request for Proposals was issued announcing that up to $750,000 would be available for multi-institutional attempts to address faculty vitality/development issues. In April 1980, six multi-institutional grants were approved, totaling $623,335.

Built into this faculty vitality program was a strong evaluation component. The Foundation contracted with Dr. R. Eugene Rice, Professor of Sociology, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California, to coordinate the overall program evaluation. Each project also had

an external evaluator selected by the project director. Yearly meetings of the project directors, focusing on a topic of common interest, were held. In addition, Dr. Rice and staff visited each project.

The Foundation was interested in assessing the strategies used to maintain and develop faculty vitality. Reports were submitted every six months from the project directors. An invitational conference was held at Spring Hill Conference Center, Wayzata, Minnesota, on October 29 and 30, 1982. Representatives from national higher education associations and foundations and the Northwest Area Foundation grant recipients were in attendance. Current and future issues of faculty development were discussed. Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, Senior Fellow, Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc., Washington, D.C., presented a provocative paper entitled "Faculty Development — Is There More Work To Do?"

From the evaluation of this grant series, the Foundation has learned some important lessons: Faculty development projects work best if they are focused on a problem or issue; faculty members need to be a part of the planning process from the beginning, with faculty taking a leadership role; central administrators need to support the project but not control it; projects have a better chance of succeeding and surviving if there is financial commitment from the institution and the project director is respected by faculty as an outstanding scholar and manager.

In recent years, the Foundation has increased its reporting on projects and programs funded by the Foundation. It has done this in the hope that what is learned from successes and failures of others might be of benefit to those initiating similar projects. Dr. Rice brings his vast experience in faculty development to this report. In 1982 he received a Mina Shaughnessey Scholar's Award for research on this topic. Dr. Rice is a graduate of Pasadena College, and holds advanced degrees from Harvard University. In addition to teaching adult development and the sociology of work and the professions, Dr. Rice has been a consultant to a number of foundations. In 1974–75, he served as program executive to the Danforth Foundation in Saint Louis, Missouri. In this study Dr. Rice has evaluated the strategies developed by the Foundation funded projects, but his analysis goes beyond the grants themselves and explores broader issues affecting faculty and institutional vitality.

The Foundation wishes to thank Dr. Rice and all those who as-

sisted with this project. The faculty vitality program was encouraged by a committee comprised of Paul Dressel, Professor Emeritus of University Research, Michigan State University; Charles J. Ping, President, Ohio University; and the late Marion L. Shane, President, Mercyhurst College. These men served on the Foundation's Higher Education Advisory Committee from 1976–80.

A list of project directors and evaluators is included in the Additional Project Information section; these names are provided so readers may contact persons involved in projects of interest to them. This section also includes brief descriptions of each project and candid comments by project directors on what worked and what didn't, how they might change the project if they were to do it again, and what advice they would give to others initiating such a project. The annotated Resources section should be useful to those interested in further reading about the professional development of faculty.

The dire enrollment predictions made a decade ago have not come to pass at most of the institutions in our region. Other variables have intervened and, even in the states with the greatest decline in high school students, the overall enrollment decline has not been as great as it was predicted to be.

The Foundation continues its interest in faculty development. In 1981 a grant was made to the American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., to develop a "Faculty Opportunity Audit." This checklist (*Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1984) can be used by institutions to assess the current campus climate for faculty development. It also provides suggestions for faculty and administrators. Through the currently funded technology grants, faculty are being trained and retrained in the use of new technologies. This focus on an issue of importance to the institution is, we believe, one of the best forms of faculty development. As Dr. Rice states in his report, "faculty development is shifting from the margins of the institutions to the center." The lack of mobility for present day faculty is a reality. Funds need to be available for faculty to develop professionally. It is this Foundation's hope that other foundations will listen carefully to the requests from institutions for faculty support. The next ten years will be critical ones for higher education but they will be years filled with new opportunities and challenges.

Martha G. Butt, *Vice President*

INTRODUCTION

Human resource development has been a major concern in business and industry for decades. In labor intensive industries particularly, the vitality of the workforce is seen as a key element in the maintenance of productivity and profits. The professions, in contrast, were expected to be self-renewing. For those in the academic profession especially, the resources for regeneration and enrichment were assumed to be readily available.

During the past decade, conditions in higher education have altered radically. Academic professionals are now faced with what one Carnegie Council study referred to as a chronic depression in the academic labor market over the next quarter-century. Faculty are confronted with enrollments that are not only declining, but shifting in more narrowly technical directions; many in mid-career feel "stuck" in departments that are fully tenured and with colleagues who are unlikely to move or change for years to come; and to make things worse, faculty are having to deal with students who are increasingly underprepared. At the same time, salaries have lagged substantially behind inflation and the autonomy that has always been a cherished part of the profession has been seriously eroded.

The problems confronting college and university faculty presently are not merely the occupational dilemmas of individuals caught in the swift currents of change. A dispirited faculty, a faculty that lacks vitality, is an institutional problem of major proportions. Academic institutions depend directly on a vital, dynamic staff to accomplish their educational missions. The faculty represents the key resource that colleges and universities have for adapting or responding pro-

The problems confronting college and university faculty presently are not merely the occupational dilemmas of individuals caught in the swift currents of change. A dispirited faculty, a faculty that lacks vitality, is an institutional problem of major proportions.

actively to the profound changes projected for the years ahead. Institutional vitality and the maintenance of a vital faculty are inexorably linked. It was in recognition of this linkage and in the interest of maintaining the quality of higher education in its region that the Northwest Area Foundation, in 1979, initiated the grant series entitled "Maintaining Faculty Vitality in the 1980s."

Even during the expansionist days in higher education, the 1960s, there was a concern for the professional development of faculty. The dominant assumption was that a faculty member developed professionally through research in his or her discipline and that good teaching would naturally follow from solid research in one's field. Professional development was encouraged through the funding of travel to professional meetings, research grants, and sabbaticals.

Early in the 1970s, the dominant assumption undergirding these traditional forms of professional development for faculty began to be questioned. College and university students were raising serious questions about the quality of teaching and new sorts of accountability were being called for. Also, the foreboding specter of institutional retrenchment in higher education was already on the horizon. It was out of this context that the serious concern for faculty development emerged.

During the last decade, private foundations and public agencies provided significant funding for faculty development activities. Most of what was done focused on the improvement of teaching or what is called instructional development. Much was learned, however, about human resource development in an educational context. A

wide spectrum of issues and approaches was explored, ranging from the interrelationship of the personal and the professional, to problems that were tied directly to institutional policies and organizational structure. Although most of the strategies devised for faculty development in the 1970s were concerned primarily with the individual faculty member, it became increasingly clear that the very structure of the academic career itself had to be re-examined and institutional policies providing for new opportunities and options for growth and change were required. Toward the end of the decade, it was evident that some faculty and their institutions would benefit most from their consideration of new careers outside the academy.

Round I of the Foundation's grant series in the area of faculty development was an open competition soliciting proposals from all colleges and universities (or groups of schools) in the Foundation's funding region. Those submitting proposals in the spring of 1979 had

Although most of the strategies devised for faculty development in the 1970s were concerned primarily with the individual faculty member, it became increasingly clear that the very structure of the academic career itself had to be re-examined.

the benefit of a decade of experience in faculty development and a number of schools in that round were already providing leadership in the field. In their search for potentially effective ways of maintaining faculty vitality, these institutions built on what had already been tried and chose to focus their efforts on academic career development. Nine grants were awarded in Round I of the Faculty Vitality series. The recipients were:

College of Saint Scholastica
Duluth, Minnesota

Colleges of Mid-America
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Concordia College
Moorhead, Minnesota

The Council of Independent Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Linfield College
McMinnville, Oregon

Mary College
Bismarck, North Dakota

Marylhurst College for Lifelong Learning
Marylhurst, Oregon

Mount Mercy College
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington

In the spring of 1980, a second round of grants addressing the concern with maintaining faculty vitality was awarded by the Foundation. In an effort to encourage the sharing of limited resources, Round II solicited proposals on a system-wide or multi-institutional basis. Six consortium proposals were funded. The institutions receiving support through this multi-institutional approach were the following:

Carleton College
Saint Olaf College
(*Minnesota*)

Grinnell College
Simpson College
Central College
Drake University
(*Iowa*)

Montana University System:
Montana State University
University of Montana
Montana College of Mineral Science & Technology
Northern Montana College
Western Montana College
Eastern Montana College

North Dakota State Board of Higher Education
All North Dakota post-secondary institutions

Southwest West Central Consortium:
Willmar Community College
Worthington Community College
Southwest State University
University of Minnesota, Morris
(*Minnesota*)

College of Saint Teresa
Winona State University
Saint Mary's College
(*Minnesota*)

STRATEGIES FOR MAINTAINING FACULTY VITALITY: THE FOUNDATION'S PROJECTS

This assessment of the Faculty Vitality grant series as a whole (Rounds I and II) is based upon five years of experience with the fifteen projects. Each project was systematically evaluated by an external evaluator each year of the funding period (the period of funding varied among the projects from one to three years). The external evaluators for this series of Foundation grants are an especially distinguished group who combine years of direct experience in faculty development with expertise in evaluation. Their annual evaluations of each of the projects provided the most substantive evidence on which this assessment is based. Each of the projects was also visited by the author of this assessment and a program officer of the Foundation, and regular reports were submitted by the director of each project. A more detailed description of the evaluation process and the names of the external evaluators and project directors for each of the grants can be found in the appendices of this document. The final evaluation reports on each of the projects may be obtained by contacting the institutions funded.

This assessment of the strategies for maintaining faculty vitality that were developed in this grant series is divided into two parts. Part one deals with those strategies that address the nature and structure of the academic career itself, that try to provide a new understanding of the academic career and open new opportunities for faculty to continue to grow and change. These strategies represent a significant advance in efforts to maintain faculty vitality and attempt to deal directly with the realities of retrenchment. Most of these strategies were devised by individual institutions in Round I of the series. Part

two assesses the multi-institutional strategies that by their very nature are required to be more comprehensive. The consortium grants usually incorporated more than one strategy.

New Approaches to Academic Career Development

During the 1970s, most of what was done under the name of faculty development focused on the individual. High priority was placed on confidentiality in dealing with faculty and efforts were made to maintain distance from the structures of power and decision-making within institutions. Faculty development was established intentionally at the margins of institutions and viewed as a means of facilitating the growth and development of faculty *despite* what was happening to the institution. More recently, professional development activities have moved from the periphery of colleges and universities to the center, and growth and change are being encouraged *because* of what is happening to the institution. There is a new recognition that institutional vitality will require the imaginative linking of the professional development of individual faculty with the carefully

There is a new recognition that institutional vitality will require the imaginative linking of the professional development of individual faculty with the carefully planned development of the institution. . . .

planned development of the institution in both its academic and non-academic aspects. There is also the acknowledgment, for the first time in decades, that for their own continuing development and that of the institution some faculty are going to have to consider employment outside of higher education.

The career development strategies for maintaining faculty vitality

while also meeting emerging institutional needs are listed below. Following the listing is a discussion of each approach and an assessment of the effort to implement it.

Career Development Strategies

Providing New Academic Roles

The development of new teaching and administrative competencies

Saint Scholastica
Mary College
Montana University System

Preparing faculty to teach the adult learner

Colleges of Mid-America
Marylhurst College for Lifelong Learning
Linfield College

Career Planning and Professional Growth Contracts

Linfield College
Mount Mercy College

Organizational Development and Institutional Planning

Concordia College

Exploration of Alternative Careers

Council of Independent Colleges and the Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest
University of Puget Sound

Providing New Academic Roles

Most institutions of higher education are now faced with not only major shifts in enrollments, but a fixed faculty and staff. The dramatic expansion of professional programs has been accompanied by a marked decline in enrollments in the social sciences and the humanities. Student demand and societal need require new programs. The financial and human resources to deal with the enrollment shifts and new program needs, however, are not available in most colleges and universities. An important strategy for dealing with this major institutional dilemma is to open new options to existing faculty within institutions. Among the grant recipients in this series, this strategy took two forms: preparing faculty to move into new teaching fields and administrative responsibilities where institutional needs are more pressing, and preparing faculty to meet the demands of a new constituency — the adult learner.

Programs of this sort encourage professional renewal by enabling faculty to develop new areas of expertise and skill, while also fostering more efficient utilization of an institution's resources by moving redundant faculty into areas of higher demand.

The development of new teaching and administrative competencies

Three of the Foundation's projects focused on assisting existing faculty to develop the capability of moving into other roles within the institution. This approach is frequently referred to as faculty respecialization or retraining. Programs of this sort encourage professional renewal by enabling faculty to develop new areas of expertise and skill, while also fostering more efficient utilization of an institution's resources by moving redundant faculty into areas of higher demand.

The **College of Saint Scholastica**'s faculty respecialization proposal was stimulated by an unexpected drop in enrollment. With the aid of Foundation funding six faculty were assisted in moving into adjacent areas of specialization (e.g., a French professor prepared to teach Spanish and an instructor in the technical aspects of media prepared to teach theoretical courses in the field). Moves of greater magnitude were taken by a professor of history who prepared to teach political theory and an instructor in music education who qualified to meet growing curricular needs in speech. During the grant period, the College initiated a Computer Information Systems major. Part of the instructional need in this new technical field was met through retraining.

One of the project goals at Saint Scholastica was to reduce the instructional budget by replacing part-time faculty with retrained, full-time faculty as the latter became competent to move into teaching areas formerly covered by part-time appointees. This institutional

goal was achieved. The negative implications of this move for part-time faculty were noted, but not assessed.

An unanticipated consequence of the grant was the spread of the idea of respecialization to faculty members not formally involved in the grant program. Several faculty have voluntarily initiated shifts into high demand areas (physics to computers; and three in psychology to gerontology). After personally interviewing each of the faculty participating in the respecialization program at Saint Scholastica, Dr. Joyce Pavlacs, the external evaluator, commented on what she felt was evidence that the participating faculty were being, in fact, revitalized. She concluded that their participation in the program "had given them direction, power, and a sense of purpose."

An important indicator of the success of a project is the willingness of an institution to continue the program after the "soft money" funding is expended. Saint Scholastica is so committed to an ongoing faculty development program that it recently raised over $400,000 as an endowment to ensure its continuance.

The "Re-education of Faculty Project" at **Mary College** was developed, in part, to respond to changing regional needs in rural North Dakota. "Areas of emphasis" in health care, social service, management, and energy have been added to the curriculum without making significant additions to the faculty. The areas of emphasis, especially the one in energy management, have the potential for attracting students and are gaining recognition for the College beyond the region.

In this small college twenty-six people have participated in the program: over half are now prepared to teach in second disciplines, others can contribute to the new areas of emphasis, and several are capable of meeting new administrative needs. The grant has provided the College and the individuals involved in the program with increased flexibility in adapting to changing needs and creating new opportunities for growth. The institution is healthier and the morale of the faculty has been substantially improved. Respecialization programs appear to work best in small institutions where disciplinary boundaries and departmental prerogatives are not particularly strong.

The largest component of the **Montana University System** project focused on faculty retraining. This aspect of the faculty vitality proj-

ect was both timely and important in Montana because of the steady state staffing conditions that have been mandated for public higher education there. New faculty cannot be appointed to meet changing student needs or occupational demands within the state unless existing faculty are released or reassigned to higher demand areas.

In this large system, the most successful retraining projects took place within single institutions and very few involved a major shift into an entirely new field. In most instances, faculty members were expanding their expertise in an area of their discipline that had not previously been a field of specialization (e.g., geology to petroleum geology), or moving into a new discipline that overlapped to a significant degree with their current discipline (e.g., political philosophy

As might be expected, given the career orientation of contemporary students, faculty members being retrained often moved from broad theoretical areas into fields of narrower specialization and/or greater practical application.

to political science). As might be expected, given the career orientation of contemporary students, faculty members being retrained often moved from broad, theoretical areas into fields of narrower specialization and/or greater practical application.

Some of the retraining projects met with considerable resistance from the receiving departments. In larger institutions particularly, there are institutional policy issues and personnel matters that need to be attended to before the re-assignment of a faculty member can be carried out successfully.

In encouraging faculty to consider new career options, the faculty retraining strategy raises the possibility that some faculty will choose to leave higher education altogether. This, in fact, happened in the retraining projects discussed above. In the past such a loss would have been a source of regret. Given the conditions within higher education today, such occurrences can have, over the long haul, a revi-

talizing effect for both the institution and the individual. One could even argue that the key problem being faced by higher education now is a societal one — the need to reallocate human resources from one sector to another, and that when a faculty member involved in a retraining program chooses to leave academia that essential reallocation process is being facilitated.

Given the need for colleges and universities to meet rapidly changing regional demands with steady-state staffing, faculty retraining and respecialization will increasingly be an established institutional procedure utilized on a regular basis. The experiences with the retraining projects in this grant series promise to be particularly useful in the years of retrenchment that lie ahead.

Preparing faculty to teach the adult learner

The ten colleges that constitute the **Colleges of Mid-America** are primarily located in rural settings and their traditional mission has been to serve the youth of the region and their sponsoring denominations. The grant from the Foundation is re-focusing that mission in modest but important ways. Recently, the colleges have become acutely aware of the need to serve the communities in which they are located. Most of these communities, particularly in rural South Dakota, have an adult population with educational needs that are not being met. The needs of rural women have become especially evident.

The institutions within the Colleges of Mid-America and their faculties are beginning to explore ways of addressing this important educational task. The grant funds were used by the central offices of the Colleges of Mid-America to coordinate the identification of the precise needs of the adult learners in the market region, retrain faculty and staff to address those needs, and deliver new programs. The grant has been particularly useful in bringing in external resources to re-orient the faculty and introduce some of the new program materials being developed to address the adult learner most effectively. The final report of the external evaluator indicates that some of the smaller colleges in the consortium are benefiting most from this program and are having the most significant impact on the adult learners in their local communities.

Marylhurst College for Lifelong Learning is providing national

leadership in the recent effort to address the needs of the adult learner. The transformation of Marylhurst from the first women's college in the Pacific Northwest (1893) to the first accredited degree-granting institution in the nation devoted primarily to lifelong learning has received widespread attention as one model of adaptive change in higher education. The grant proposal submitted to the Foundation was entitled: "Faculty Development in a Non-traditional Setting." The primary purpose of the grant was to prepare its faculty, the majority of whom serve on an adjunct basis, for the new mission of the institution — educating the adult learner.

This one year grant served not only the faculty and staff of Marylhurst, but provided a key resource for addressing the needs of the adult learner in the Pacific Northwest. Leading theorists and practitioners in the field of adult education (e.g., Malcolm Knowles and Cyril Houle) were made accessible to large audiences in effective workshop settings.

The changing role of the part-time faculty member is a topic that needs attending to and might well be addressed in an on-going effort to maintain faculty vitality.

The professional development needs of adjunct faculty at Marylhurst were constructively addressed through the grant activities. The external evaluator, J. Wesley Brown, carefully documents these important achievements. That adjunct and part-time faculty at Marylhurst and elsewhere need more adequate institutionalized support services is also evident from the evaluation report. The changing role of the part-time faculty member is a topic that needs attending to and might well be addressed in an on-going effort to maintain faculty vitality.

Linfield College had as one of the components of its grant the development of an off-campus program aimed primarily at adult learners. It is now abundantly evident that faculty development activities are necessary to prepare faculty to deal with this new clien-

tele. With the assistance of the Foundation's grant, faculty at Linfield have been trained in developing criteria for assessing experiential learning and have been able to address the special problems and opportunities involved in teaching adult students. More than forty of the Linfield faculty participated in this aspect of the project.

In developing an off-campus program, Linfield is shifting its institutional mission to some extent and faculty development is a necessary component of adapting to that shift. The project contributed not only to the development of new competencies for faculty in dealing with this new thrust, but also provided better understanding of the new program for adult learners and greater legitimacy for this kind of non-traditional education within the institution.

Career Planning and Professional Growth Contracts

Career assessment and planning have been slow to come to the academic profession. It has only been in the face of an uncertain future that faculty have felt the need for planning for professional growth and the assessment of career options.

Among the colleges in the Pacific Northwest, **Linfield College** leads the way in academic career planning. Linfield experienced enrollment decline and inordinate financial pressures in the mid-seventies. One of the responses to these difficulties was the establishment of an effective faculty development program. It was this positive experience with faculty development that made raising the career issue at Linfield less threatening. The process for "Professional Development Planning" used at Linfield drew heavily on the Gordon College Faculty Growth Contract approach. Gordon College (Wenham, Massachusetts) led the way in individualizing faculty planning for personal and professional growth that also addresses institutional needs. Linfield refined the process by doing more with career assessment. The work that has been done at Linfield is especially promising and ought to be monitored for evidence of long-term benefit. The individual professional development plans submitted with Linfield's final report are indeed impressive.

The supportive leadership of the Dean of the College and the professional competence of the director of the program, Frank Bumpus, were critical in the success of the program. In developing the pro-

gram, preference was given to mid-career faculty over the age of 40 and particularly to faculty who proposed to develop new competence in academic areas underrepresented in the College.

The original Foundation project at **Mount Mercy College** also focused on career planning for faculty. The prior experience with an effective faculty development program that made such an approach acceptable at Linfield was lacking at Mount Mercy. Mount Mercy also had extraordinary difficulty, at first, finding a director for the program who could work well with members of the faculty in what is clearly a particularly sensitive area. The College also had problems

Serious and responsible peer review is required of faculty in colleges interested in using the professional growth contract strategy.

establishing a comprehensive professional growth contract program because its faculty is very reluctant to make decisions regarding such basic faculty development resources as sabbatical leaves. Serious and responsible peer review is required of faculty in colleges interested in using the professional growth contract strategy. The Faculty Development Committee at Mount Mercy has apparently refused to take on this potentially difficult collegial responsibility.

After the first year, Mount Mercy appointed one of its own faculty as director of the program and requested permission from the Foundation to change significantly the original program proposal. A very imaginative faculty development program using an "Individual Growth Portfolio" was replaced with more traditional faculty development activities such as granting leaves, providing funds for faculty travel, and sponsoring workshops aimed primarily at the improvement of teaching. The new director provided especially able leadership and the more modest goals were pursued assiduously; it is apparent that the redefined program was a marked success. It is a program, however, that ought to be funded as a part of the institution's regular budget. Toward this end, the Board of Trustees at

Mount Mercy has approved a $300,000 professional development endowment fund as part of the upcoming capital campaign.

Organizational Development and Institutional Planning

Faculty development in the 1970s focused primarily on the individual. One of the important lessons learned from that decade of experience with faculty development is that more attention must be paid to institutional policies and planning and the way academic organizations function. Much of the effort to maintain faculty vitality through the remainder of this decade needs to focus on organizational development and institutional planning.

The Concordia program focused on the role of the academic department in facilitating faculty development.

Concordia College has been utilizing a long-range planning process to inform its faculty development activities for some time now. Their grant proposal addressed the important institutional questions more directly than any other project in the series.

The Concordia program focused on the role of the academic department in facilitating faculty development. Self-studies were initiated in sixteen departments and thirty-nine faculty developed professional growth projects that built on the long-range planning process. (Over 85 per cent of the total faculty of 160 participated in at least one facet of the grant program.) During the site visit, questions were raised about individual faculty projects that appeared on the surface to focus almost exclusively on the personal and professional needs of the faculty member. In each case, the thorough way in which the individual project was integrated with long-range institutional planning was demonstrated.

Concordia is also pioneering in the analysis and development of personnel policies, particularly those related to early retirement. In addition, the college is in the process of drafting policies which would increase the career alternatives available to faculty as well as protect the college's ability to adapt to changing conditions.

The organizational development and institutional planning activities being pursued at Concordia need to be carefully monitored and an effective dissemination process is called for. Concordia is leading the way in relating individual career planning to institutional policies and planning. The results of the work being done there need to be shared more broadly. Joe E. Elmore, the external evaluator, concluded his final report with these words: "[Concordia College] is one of the few (perhaps only?) colleges with a strong departmental structure and governance that retains a solid sense of collegiality and community. The Northwest Area Foundation grant has strengthened that sense."

Exploration of Alternative Careers

There are a number of academic career transition projects functioning at present. They are generally designed for people trained in the humanities and social sciences. Participants are frequently in the early stages of their academic careers — new Ph.D.'s or individuals who have not yet completed their dissertations. The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (since renamed **Council of Independent Colleges**) and the **Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest** submitted a proposal to the Foundation intended to address the needs of mid-career faculty who were willing to consider alternative careers. It was an ambitious project involving twenty-seven four-year institutions across the Northwest.

The original title of the project was "In Support of Alternative Careers." After the first year the title was changed to "In Support of Career Planning and Development." To speak directly of career change was perceived in 1979 as either too threatening to faculty or unnecessary. The project began very slowly and was significantly revised during the grant period. The program finally focused more on career renewal than on transitions into non-academic careers.

The Life and Career Planning Workshop that was developed and refined through this project is one of the most effective of its kind. What was regrettably lost from the program as originally proposed is the development of policies and procedures on individual campuses that would support faculty and administrators in making the transition from academic to non-academic employment. This kind of administrative structural work needs to be done and should be at-

What was regrettably lost from the program . . . is the development of policies and procedures . . . that would support faculty and administrators in making the transition from academic to non-academic employment. This kind of administrative structural work needs to be done . . . before the climate of crisis in higher education thickens.

tended to before the climate of crisis in higher education thickens. In a number of ways, the original proposal from the Council of Independent Colleges was ahead of its time. As the pressures of retrenchment escalate, there is an increasing demand for consortium-based programs to facilitate the transition of faculty into non-academic employment.

The **University of Puget Sound**'s "Program in Career Transition" also started slowly. It too was perceived by faculty as threatening, particularly since the project was initiated by the administration. A major component of the U.P.S. program was the non-academic internship for faculty. The pioneering work that U.P.S. has done with faculty internships will be instructive for the rest of higher education in the years ahead.

Gary Peterson, the coordinator of the program, found the internship arrangements and the administration of the program to be rewarding, but difficult. As he put it: "Coordination with faculty and the 'employing' community is not a simple task." Fluctuations in the economic climate created problems that were exasperating, but understandable. The lack of dependability and follow-through on the part of faculty was more difficult to understand. This response is congruent with the experience of directors of similar efforts elsewhere. The kinds of successes that were achieved through Puget

Sound's internship program are evident in this quotation from a participating faculty member:

> *I do like the sense of independence and flexibility the internship has given me — it has reconfirmed that education takes place in a larger context and that college teaching can be more than I had thought. But I also know I can do other things, particularly consulting. I have learned that I don't have to move, and that I couldn't have gotten that without doing serious thinking about transition — putting what I've done in context.*

The Careers in Transition program was initiated with the intention of assisting faculty in the exploration of alternative careers. As with the Council of Independent Colleges grant, the emphasis on what in the corporate world is called "outplacement" had to be softened and approached only indirectly. Tenured faculty are not yet willing to declare publicly that they are, in fact, interested in considering alternative careers. They want the opportunity to explore career options, but not in public workshops on their own campuses. The University of Puget Sound project did reveal that tenured faculty will take advantage of more confidential services, such as individual consultation with a trusted advisor or a small support group dealing with the topic.

In refocusing the program on career planning and development, the University of Puget Sound project took a variety of approaches to opening new opportunities and options for faculty. The project played an important role in the establishment of a formal early retirement policy. An intensive course in business administration was offered for liberal arts faculty. The final evaluation report indicates that the business course, although deemed successful, would have

Tenured faculty are not yet willing to declare publicly that they are, in fact, interested in considering alternative careers. They want the opportunity to explore career options, but not in public workshops on their own campuses.

been more effective had it been placed later in the program — after the career planning components and the completion of the internships.

A striking characteristic of the Careers in Transition project was the large number of non-tenured faculty participating in the program. Over 40 percent of the U.P.S. faculty took part in some aspect of the project, but the majority of those participating were either not on tenure track or were part-time. The spouses of faculty were also invited to take part in the program. Stephen Scholl, the external evaluator, identified this as part of the genius of the project and pointed out that: "This is the population that is experiencing a disproportionate share of unease, the people who are by definition in transition." Scholl goes on to indicate that many corporations have found that offering career services to such transient employees and to spouses is one way to improve significantly the morale and productivity of all employees. In his evaluation, Scholl found that this feature of the program contributed markedly to the improvement of the general climate in the institution.

The projects funded through Round I of the Faculty Vitality series were carefully conceived and, for the most part, were effectively implemented. A number of the institutions funded in that initial round already had fully developed faculty development programs and, in fact, had made important contributions to the faculty development effort during the 1970s — Concordia, Linfield, and the Council of Independent Colleges come immediately to mind. The proposals submitted in Round I were built upon substantial experience in the area of professional development, and talented, informed leadership — an ingredient critical to the success of a project — was available to direct the implementation of the programs that were funded. The Request for Proposals for Round II of the Faculty Vitality series elicited a very different set of projects.

Multi-Institutional Approaches

Round II of the Faculty Vitality series represents an experiment with multi-institutional grants. It was assumed that "some efforts to maintain or improve faculty vitality are best pursued on a state-wide, regional, or multi-institutional basis." It was hoped that this ap-

proach would encourage larger systems in the area served by the Foundation to address faculty development retrenchment issues in a collaborative way.

In contrast with the Round I projects that, in general, built on previous experience with faculty development and were more task specific, the proposals solicited in Round II required that institutions collaborate on what was for most a new kind of endeavor. The proposals were of necessity more general in scope and the strategies utilized had to be applicable in more than one institutional setting. Several of the projects funded focused on a single strategy that was shared across institutions. Others made available a number of different approaches to maintaining faculty vitality that built upon the variety of resources and strengths represented among the institutions making up the consortium. The multi-institutional strategies for maintaining faculty vitality are listed below and following the listing is a discussion of each approach and an assessment.

Multi-Institutional Strategies

Faculty Development Through State-Wide Systems
Montana University System
North Dakota State Board of Higher Education

A Regional Consortium Approach
Southwest West Central Consortium (*Minnesota*)

Faculty Development Through Public Private Cooperation
Winona Tri-College University Consortium (*Minnesota*)

Focus on the Liberal Arts
Iowa Liberal Arts Project

Scholarship and the Maintenance of Faculty Vitality
Carleton Saint Olaf International Studies Project (*Minnesota*)

Faculty Development Through State-Wide Systems

One of the Foundation's primary motivations for making multi-institutional grants was the anticipation that the commitment to maintaining faculty vitality would be given higher priority within statewide systems if effective programs could be launched through

external funding. The assumption was made that if faculty development is worth doing, it ought to be carried out on a long-term basis, across systems. Two states in the region received funding, Montana and North Dakota, with each emphasizing a very different approach.

Maintaining Faculty Vitality Through Inter-Institutional Projects and Faculty Exchanges: Montana University System

The largest grant in the Faculty Vitality series went to the **Montana University System**. The six colleges and universities in the Montana system are having to deal with the same shifting societal and educational conditions confronting the institutions of higher education in the rest of the region. The Montana situation is complicated, however, by its geographical isolation and the substantial distances separating the schools in the system. Accompanying this sense of isolation is the perception that the system is becoming increasingly managerial, having begun to abandon a more informal, collegial culture in favor of uniform, systematic procedures, and having launched a strong movement toward collective bargaining. There is a commitment to inter-institutional cooperation in the system, but joint endeavors such as the Faculty Vitality project take place in the face of significant inter-institutional differences and some rivalry. The Montana system is also plagued by major financial constraints in the state and substantial change in campus and system-level leadership.

The Faculty Vitality project in Montana had three central components: 1) faculty retraining and reallocation, 2) faculty exchanges (between campuses), and 3) instructional improvements responsive to shifting student needs and interests within the state. The faculty retraining and reallocation component was the project's largest and addressed directly the steady-state staffing conditions current in the system. This component of the Montana project was discussed at length earlier in this document.

As a system-wide initiative, the Montana University Faculty Vitality project was intended to make a difference inter-institutionally as well as within single institutions in the system. The *inter-institutional exchanges* that proved most successful were not of the type usually envisioned as faculty exchanges and anticipated in the initial pro-

In fact, faculty exchanges of this sort proved difficult to manage logistically and often seemed to leave an individual faculty member with little support on either the host or home campus.

posal to the Foundation (long term — semester/quarter — exchange of faculty between institutions). In fact, faculty exchanges of this sort proved difficult to manage logistically and often seemed to leave an individual faculty member with little support on either the host or home campus. Montana's disappointing experience with the one-for-one faculty exchanges across institutions is congruent with the problems encountered in other institutions and consortia attempting to maintain faculty vitality through faculty exchanges of this sort.

All of the inter-institutional exchanges were developed in response to a call for proposals sent to faculty on each of the six campuses. The exchange projects that were most successful involved short-term events (conferences, lecture series) that engaged a substantial number of faculty across institutions. One of the more successful was a statewide conference on child development. It encouraged cross-campus communication while providing participants with new knowledge and increasing respect for their own discipline, and resulted finally in the formation of a state-wide association. Two other projects judged particularly effective involved having faculty members from other campuses make presentations on topics of immediate concern to faculty at the host institution. This approach helped establish networks of collegial support and sharing across institutions, while enhancing feelings of self-esteem and competence among visiting faculty and providing faculty on the host campus with new skills and knowledge.

The emphasis in many of the *instructional improvement projects* focused on the improvement of student writing and the use of computers for instructional purposes — major areas of concern in most American colleges and universities. These projects led to a number of follow-up activities. The interest in student writing resulted in a new

state-wide initiative dealing with "Thinking and Writing Across the Curriculum." Toward the end of the grant, the attention given to computers and teaching led to the establishment of a newsletter within the system on the instructional use of computers.

In examining the features that the successful projects hold in common, the project evaluators drew several conclusions. On the small campuses virtually any project was likely to have an impact, given the scarcity of resources. Projects were usually successful if they enabled the faculty at the smaller institutions to establish contact with colleagues on other campuses or if they involved most of the faculty at the college (not feasible on the larger campuses).

On the larger campuses, projects were more likely to be successful if the participation of faculty was voluntary and if the project blended individual and institutional benefits. These projects were likely to receive colleague support and to yield results that were not initially envisioned. The more successful projects were also tied to larger departmental and institutional goals and involved planning for follow-up activity.

Funding agencies often complain that too much of a grant is spent on administration. With the Montana project, the opposite was true; not enough was invested in coordinating the grant. The project was not effectively administered from the central office. The primary responsibility for the project was assigned to a staff member who was already over extended and, in addition, involved in collective bargaining with faculty, as a representative of the state. His rapport with faculty was, needless-to-say, seriously compromised from the outset. Beginning faculty development activities do not need this kind of added burden and good central coordination is required, particularly when the grant involves a consortium of colleges and universities.

Projects in all three components of Montana's Faculty Vitality program were generated by faculty members on each of the six campuses. This grassroots approach to faculty development has much to commend it — particularly in system-wide settings. Ninety-seven project proposals were submitted from faculty across the six institutions. Twenty-eight of the projects were funded. The Faculty Vitality project concluded with a major conference involving 136 faculty and administrators from all six campuses where what was learned from the project was shared and assessed.

In the evaluation research that has been done on different faculty development strategies, conferences, seminars, and workshops without extensive follow-up activities have not fared well.

Faculty development has now been accepted as an established concern within the Montana University System. The lasting impact of the grant, however, is to be found in the ideas that were generated, the collegial networks that were formed, and the inter-institutional projects that had their origin under the auspices of the grant but now have a life of their own.

System-wide Conferences and Workshops for Faculty: North Dakota Board of Higher Education

In the evaluation research that has been done on different faculty development strategies, conferences, seminars, and workshops without extensive follow-up activities have not fared well. There was good reason for being skeptical about the long-term benefit of the seminar programs that were established by the **North Dakota Board of Higher Education**. The seminars were one-time events on topics of widespread interest to faculty. There were five seminars, each on a different topic:

Biology, the Emergent Discipline: Challenges to Public Policy
The Baccalaureate Degree: A Common Language
Life Transitions
General Education
Education in Transition

The extensive evaluation of the impact of the seminars conducted by the Formative Evaluation Research Associates (Ann Arbor, Michigan) challenges the wide-spread skepticism about such an approach, particularly in areas such as North Dakota. While it might still be argued that this is not a strategy to be duplicated elsewhere, it was fully justified as a beginning approach to faculty development in North Dakota. The isolation — small population, distances between

Montana and North Dakota are the kind of states where system-wide efforts are most needed. The isolation, distance between institutions, small population, and rural nature of the states make these kinds of common endeavors appropriate, if not required.

towns, rural setting — makes the bringing of faculty together around topics of serious professional interest a major source of renewal.

All of the institutions of higher education in the state (public and private) sent participants to the seminars and approximately 90 percent of those attending found the experience worthwhile. The chief academic officers, when queried, said that the seminars were most helpful in stimulating serious discussion of important educational issues back on home campuses. The participants themselves (75 percent) claimed that their seminar experiences translated directly into educational applications. These applications included a serious review of course content, teaching methods, the purpose or goals of the courses, and changes in the areas addressed by the seminar. The participants also valued the opportunity for interaction with colleagues from other institutions.

The evaluations of the North Dakota project attribute the enormous success of the Faculty Development Seminar Series to three factors. First, the seminars were well planned. The seminar topics and presenters were carefully selected. Nationally-known figures capable of grappling effectively with key issues in higher education were invited to North Dakota. Second, the topics were highly relevant to the participants' interests and needs. There is evidence that the participant selection process was successful. Third, the length and format of the seminars, which combined stimulating presentations and opportunities for small group participation, met participants' concerns.

The two Foundation grants to state-wide systems demonstrated

that there are strategies that can contribute to the maintenance of faculty vitality on a systems basis. The Montana project was more ambitious and will undoubtedly have a larger impact over a longer period. The critical difference here was the tie to on-going institutional commitments and programs. Montana and North Dakota are the kind of states where system-wide efforts are most needed. The isolation, distance between institutions, small population, and rural nature of the states makes these kinds of common endeavors appropriate, if not required. It is disappointing that in neither state was continuing, permanent funding for the faculty vitality projects assured.

A Regional Consortium Approach

The **Southwest West Central Consortium** is located in the southwest central region of Minnesota. It brings together institutions from three different systems of higher education within the state: the two community colleges at Willmar and Worthington, Southwest State University (Marshall), and the University of Minnesota at Morris.

The consortium stimulated interest in inter-institutional endeavors to maintain faculty vitality through three carefully planned annual retreats. Specific projects involving faculty across institutions in the region were generated out of those annual conferences. The consortium combined the key features existing separately in the North Dakota and Montana projects to address a similar regional problem, rural isolation. This imaginative combination was especially effective.

Colman O'Connell from the College of Saint Benedict conducted an elaborate evaluation of the program and found that one of the most important outcomes was the laying of a foundation on which on-going faculty vitality projects could be built. For example, a project funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, bringing together faculty from the four campuses, built on the earlier cooperative experience in the consortium. A visiting poet has participated in activities on all the campuses and faculty have identified courses that can be exchanged, enriching the curricula of the participating institutions.

A cooperative mathematics project is having a major impact on the relationship between institutions of higher education and high

schools in the region. Large numbers of junior and senior high school students have been persuaded to enroll in mathematics courses as a direct result of the mathematics project's Speakers Bureau program. During the 1982–1983 school year, for example, 1,360 students were visited by faculty from Southwest State University and 3,500 students by faculty from the University of Minnesota at Morris. The concept is now spreading to mathematics programs in other areas of Minnesota and South Dakota, and faculty from other disciplines are conducting inquiries into the relevance of this model for their areas of study.

Extensive interviews with faculty across the four campuses showed that the Faculty Vitality project has enhanced the teaching role for faculty as distinct from their disciplinary identities. The public service role has also been highlighted and encouraged by project activities. Serious questions are now being raised by faculty about the reward systems functioning in the institutions: "Will these activities be deemed as appropriate as scholarly publication when tenure and promotion decisions are made?"

What is particularly intriguing about the Southwest West Central Consortium program is that the eight projects in the program were initiated and developed by faculty for faculty. The concerns with the quality of teaching, curriculum development, and public service were an expression of faculty interest and not institutionally imposed. The strong sense of faculty ownership and the focus on student learning were major strengths of the program.

Faculty Development Through Public/Private Cooperation

Winona, Minnesota, has three institutions of higher education that joined together to establish the **Tri-College/University Cooperative Faculty Development Program**. The institutions are the College of Saint Teresa, Saint Mary's College, and Winona State University. The effort to work cooperatively across public/private institutional lines was one of the project's major virtues, as well as a source of considerable difficulty. Drawing on the resources of all three institutions, a comprehensive faculty development program was developed. It had five major facets: 1) the improvement of instruction, 2) preparation for alternative careers and for retirement, 3) personal and professional enrichment of faculty (particularly of tenured faculty in mid-

The effort to work cooperatively across public/private institutional lines was one of the project's major virtues, as well as a source of considerable difficulty.

career), 4) incentive grants to support individual faculty with study and research projects, and 5) faculty internships in business, industry, and government services.

The three schools, two private and one public, had the prior experience of operating in a loose consortial arrangement for more than a decade. Thus, an existing format for inter-institutional cooperation was available to provide the structure required for joint programming in faculty development. The proximity of the three campuses, their recent histories, and the general socio-economic and demographic factors of the region provided a promising, yet tense, environment for the faculty development project.

The program was administered by an executive committee consisting of three tri-college/university coordinators (faculty members representing each of the institutions), with one serving as chairperson and program director. This committee worked closely with the three chief academic officers of the cooperating institutions. The success of the program was due in large measure to the credibility the coordinators enjoyed on their own campuses and brought to the endeavor. During the grant period there was an incredible amount of turnover in the leadership of the three institutions (presidents and deans). Continuity in the faculty development program has been credited to the organizational skills and energetic commitment of Sister Johanna Orlett of the College of Saint Teresa who served as program director and gave the project stability despite the fluctuation in leadership.

Each of the five components of the program was planned and implemented by a faculty committee made up of representatives of the three participating institutions. One of the most promising components, the instructional improvement emphasis, proved to be one of the most disappointing. George Brushaber, President of Bethel Col-

lege and external evaluator of the program, suggests that this emphasis lacked success ". . . because there was no visible or direct tie to the reward system, little support from senior administrators, and no sustained ownership by the faculty." On the other hand, the Committee on Faculty Internships and Consulting Experiences accomplished much more than was expected. The practical and informal nature of much of the programming (e.g., brown-bag sessions) made the opportunities accessible and attractive to faculty. Individualized resources for support were available through on-staff facilitators, professional consultants, a long-distance telephone service, and a strong network of persons with common interests and diverse experiences providing informed encouragement.

The strengths of the organizational approach taken by the Tri-College University project were the volunteerism, the internal consulting, the inter-institutional collegiality, and the freedom to evolve as needs and interests were discerned by faculty. Some of the weaknesses were endemic to the consortial approach. It is Dr. Brushaber's judgment that the Faculty Development Program suffered from the erosion of commitment to the Tri-College University Consortium.

The multi-institutional character of the project worked against efforts to relate faculty development activities to curriculum change, reward structures, long-range planning, and other structural features that are institutionally specific.

Also, the multi-institutional character of the project worked against efforts to relate faculty development activities to curriculum change, reward structures, long-range planning, and other structural features which are institutionally specific. The consortium approach appears to work best where there are common structural features cutting across the institutions involved, or where the cooperative task requires distance from the institutional structures and authority (e.g., the consideration of alternative careers).

Focus on the Liberal Arts

Much of the current work with general education focuses on the structure of the curriculum. The genius of the **Iowa Liberal Arts Project** is that it was concerned primarily with faculty and the need for special preparation and support to teach in general education and interdisciplinary programs. Most contemporary faculty are highly specialized and do not have the background or confidence necessary to participate in a broad based program of liberal learning. The "Summer Seminars in the Liberal Arts" for the faculty members of Grinnell, Simpson, Central, and Drake provided the kind of expanding experience that faculty need, and did it with marked success.

Twenty-one seminars were offered to liberal arts faculty of the four schools over the three-year grant period. Especially impressive is the extent of faculty participation in the program. Roughly half of the eligible faculty members at both Simpson and Central participated in at least one seminar during the three years, along with approximately one-third of the larger faculties of Drake and Grinnell. More than 20 percent of the participants signed up for a second seminar and several chose to participate every year. It is significant that in their final evaluations of the seminars, all of the participants said they would recommend the experience to faculty colleagues.

In a discussion with the four chief academic officers of the schools involved in the project, the external evaluator, Jon W. Fuller (Great Lakes Colleges Association), identified a number of positive changes on individual campuses being credited to participation in the summer seminars. One academic officer noted that "people reach out more; they attend each other's classes more freely." Faculty have also received tangible encouragement to engage in interdisciplinary work; it is seen as more highly valued within the institutions. Participants in the summer seminars have taken the lead in shaping new senior interdisciplinary courses now being offered at Simpson and have been active in planning for a major project funded by the Sloan Foundation at Grinnell. Seminar alumni have organized "brown bag lunch" discussions among faculty members at Drake.

Most striking in this grant project was the intellectual excitement generated among faculty. Faculty members became students in other fields for a time and had the opportunity to discover again the intrin-

sic joy of learning something new. They also had a chance to see good teachers in action and were compelled to re-evaluate their own approaches to the teaching and learning process.

Scholarship and the Maintenance of Faculty Vitality

There are several especially strong liberal arts colleges in the northwest region that will not be seriously affected by the enrollment declines expected in the area generally. Faculty development, however, is a concern not only of those institutions faced with steady-state staffing or retrenchment, but of every college and university. The more traditional forms of faculty development must continue to be sustained. Faculty excellence depends on support for research, adequate sabbatical programs, and funding for travel to professional meetings. These are not frills that can be eliminated without affecting quality. The more recently devised strategies for maintaining faculty vitality in a time of retrenchment cannot be viewed as a substitute for this kind of basic professional development support.

Carleton and **Saint Olaf** are both well known for their international studies programs on the home campuses, for their study programs abroad, and for the scholarly work of their faculty members in international studies. The project built on solid strengths in two distinguished colleges. The results of this collaboration in faculty development should prove exemplary. It is important that faculty development programs not be seen as primarily remedial. This Foundation grant clearly counters that image.

During each of the three years of the project a different and distinctive international theme was chosen:

1981–1982: "Religion and Politics"
1982–1983: "The State and Capitalist Economies"
1983–1984: "Migration, Economic Growth, and Cultural Pluralism"

Faculty teams, including members from each campus, determined the topic for a particular year. This topic then provided the framework for the year's activities. Each year, four or five faculty members were selected to pursue specialized summer research projects at major research centers on topics clustering around the common theme. In the late summer, back on campus, the research scholars conducted an interdisciplinary workshop for a larger group of faculty

and organized semi-annual colloquia between the colleges based on the annual theme. The highlight of each year was a major international studies symposium bringing scholars of national stature to the Northfield campuses.

The annual symposia have been especially successful. By design, the leading scholars in the field of study are invited to speak alongside, and participate in seminars with, Saint Olaf and Carleton faculty. With the added assistance of the research support made available through the grant, the Carleton and Saint Olaf faculty members have been able to hold their own with the acknowledged leaders in

Faculty excellence depends on support for research, adequate sabbatical programs, and funding for travel to professional meetings. These are not frills that can be eliminated without affecting quality.

their fields. As a result, according to Peter Stanley, former Dean at Carleton, "professional self-esteem in the two colleges has grown measurably."

Another strength of the program is the prominent role played by students. Students were awarded research grants so that they too could share in every aspect of the year's events. A special student-faculty symposium focusing on the students' projects has been planned.

Northfield, Minnesota, is a very small town and Saint Olaf and Carleton stand in close proximity. It could be assumed that the faculties of the two schools already work in close collaboration, particularly in such fields as international studies. This is clearly not the case. The Faculty Vitality grant to Saint Olaf and Carleton is making a major contribution in this regard. A collaborative model has now been established in the international studies area and has been demonstratively beneficial. It is a model that can now be replicated on a wider scale. The value of the multi-institutional dimension of Round II of the Foundation's Faculty Vitality series was, again, evident.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT — FROM PERIPHERY TO THE CENTER: A CONCLUDING ESSAY

Over the past decade, much has been learned about faculty lives and academic careers. The Foundation's grant series "Maintaining Faculty Vitality in the 1980s" represents a second generation endeavor in the field of faculty development. Much of the earlier effort focused on the individual. The primary concern was with teaching improvement and private — usually confidential — consultation. Priority was placed on maintaining distance from the sources of academic decision-making, particularly those related to tenure and promotion. The approach was intentionally peripheral.

Faculty development is now in the process of shifting from the margins of institutions to the center. The new concern is with connections, linkages, decision-making, and integration. No longer is faculty development conceived of as an independent entity or separate enterprise; it has moved to the heart of efforts to maintain institutional vitality. There is wide-spread recognition that if institutions of higher education are going to be kept dynamic and alive, capable of growing qualitatively in an increasingly restricted market, attention must be paid to the vitality of faculty.

The experience with the Foundation's Faculty Vitality series points to four specific connections or linkages that need to be made — new directions for faculty development as it moves from the margins of academic institutions to the core. The first has to do with what it means for faculty to be professional in a profoundly changing con-

text. The second addresses the relationship between faculty renewal and student development. The third is concerned with the faculty role and new or re-oriented connections with the world of work external to the college or university. And the fourth focuses on the need for effective linkages between academic planning and professional development.

Being Professional Academically

So much of what was known earlier as faculty development was instrumental and methodological. It is now time to raise the questions of meaning. What does it mean to be a professional in a changing academic context?

Much about life is defined and shaped by socially constructed fictions, patterns of meaning, that cohere in a particular time and place. Nowhere in the contemporary world do these socially constructed fictions have more power than in the professions and there is no occupational group where a socially constructed, professional imagery dominates more thoroughly than among faculty. Reference needs to be made only to the years of graduate school socialization and the inordinate influence that academic mentors have in the lives of faculty to make the argument.

Beginning in the late 1950s and extending through the following decade and a half — the period frequently referred to as the "golden age" of higher education — a dominant model of what it means to be professional emerged and became firmly established among fac-

There is no occupational group where a socially constructed, professional imagery dominates more thoroughly than among faculty. Reference needs to be made only to the years of graduate school socialization and the inordinate influence that academic mentors have in the lives of faculty to make the argument.

ulty. It was often reflected in the personnel policies of institutions, but became most solidly ingrained in faculty members' conceptions of themselves as professionals. The assumptions clustering around this image of the academic professional were these:

- Research is the central professional endeavor and the focus of academic life.
- Quality is preserved in the academic profession through peer review and the maintenance of professional autonomy.
- The pursuit of knowledge is best organized according to discipline (and, as a consequence, disciplinary-based departmental structures).
- The distinctive task of the academic profession is the pursuit of cognitive truth.
- The pursuit of knowledge is for its own sake.
- Reputations are established through national and international professional associations.
- Professional rewards and mobility accrue to those who persistently accentuate their specializations.

These interrelated elements were woven into a fabric of consensus that became the assumptive world into which the faculty that are now in mid-career were initiated. The men and women who were in graduate school during the expansionist days in higher education now form the majority of faculty in mid-career in the colleges and universities across the nation struggling with the problems of steady-state staffing and retrenchment.

This model of the academic professional has become problematic for higher education, not because it is inappropriate in itself, but because it contributed to a view of the academic career that is one dimensional and continues to be normative for the majority of faculty regardless of the type of institution in which they work. The model is having an especially debilitating effect on higher education because it is becoming a major stumbling block in efforts to adapt constructively to the profound social, economic, and political changes confronting colleges and universities in these difficult times.

As faculty members look toward what is at best an ambiguous future, they cling tenaciously to that established professional model internalized so thoroughly during graduate school days. Rather than look for new ways of dealing with the difficult problems confronting higher education or responding to opportunities for renewal or even

To become involved in programs for the adult learner, interdisciplinary studies, or, even, general education is to take on a kind of second class citizenship — to move toward the margins of the profession.

new career options, they accentuate and narrow further that older established career path. In times of stress we choose the familiar.

In retrenching institutions, the academic professional model is being used to rationalize very difficult and often arbitrary judgments. In some institutions in distress it is being invoked as an anesthesia in the management of pain.

It is somehow ironic that the programmatic areas that could provide new sources of institutional vitality over the next decade are precisely those areas where if faculty get involved, given the dominant professional model, they run the risk of being de-classed professionally. To become involved in programs for the adult learner, interdisciplinary studies, or, even, general education is to take on a kind of second class citizenship — to move toward the margins of the profession.

Called for in the days ahead is not simply "more professional development," but a re-examination of the nature and structure of faculty careers and what it means to be professional. Important headway has been made in this regard in the Foundation's grant series, and particularly among the projects in Round I where the primary focus was on developing new opportunities and options for faculty.

In reviewing the historic changes over the past two decades in higher education, Clark Kerr points out that the bulk of that monumental growth was absorbed, not by the research universities where the academic professional model is most appropriate, but by the rest of the system. In fact, the percentage of all enrollments in the Research Universities 1 (1976, Carnegie classification) actually fell between 1960 and 1980 from nearly 20 percent to below 10 percent. Over 90 percent of the growth has been in institutions where the academic professional model is only marginally appropriate. And

yet, most faculty in mid-career measure their success as professionals by that model. The mismatch between the professional ideal and working realities is a problem of no mean proportion.

Faculty Renewal and Student Development

For Erik Erikson, the central developmental task for people in middle adulthood is the struggle with "generativity versus stagnation." The majority of our present faculty are in this season of life. Generativity, for Erikson, has two sides. The first, and most obvious, relates to productivity and accomplishment — doing and making; the other side has to do with caring. Most of us do more than we can care for. It is the doing that is valued in the society and was given highest priority — "scholarly productivity" — in the working lives of faculty during the expansionist days of higher education.

The major changes of the 1970s ushered in new challenges and priorities. Faculty have been called upon to address that other side of generativity, the need to care. Over the next decade, much of the work in faculty development will be linked to issues of student development. The differences in how students learn, the diversity in student backgrounds, the variety and inadequacy in student preparation will have to be confronted in a serious way.

A new concern for the student as a learner is emerging. In the past, most faculty knew very little about how the student learns and were confident that they were not missing much.

A new concern for the student as learner is emerging. In the past, most faculty knew very little about how the student learns and were confident that they were not missing much. Faculty are now becoming increasingly exposed to the theory and research on student development and finding it fascinating. For instance, they are very responsive to the work of William Perry on *The Cognitive and Ethical*

Development of Students in the College Years (1970). The discovery of how students "make meaning" out of what faculty do and say in different learning contexts can be immediately illuminating and is regarded as intellectually challenging. The same can be said of David Kolb's inquiry into learning styles (*Experiential Learning*, 1984).

This recent interest in the student as learner has been at the heart of three of the Foundation's projects in this grant series. The grants to the Colleges of Mid-America, Marylhurst College, and Linfield College focused, particularly, on the adult learner and drew not only on the new research on student development, but integrated it into the recent work on adult development. These projects are important harbingers of things to come among those concerned with the professional development of faculty.

A major factor in the widespread discouragement of faculty is that the students have changed. They are not as well prepared as were students when faculty now in mid-career entered the profession and they are more diverse racially, ethnically, and in terms of class. Given the political and ethical commitments of most faculty, faculty members are getting what they asked for: a genuinely pluralistic society that takes higher education seriously, that moves disadvantaged groups into post-secondary education in increasingly larger numbers. The challenge of the underprepared student is one that faculty and those concerned with faculty development have yet to take up in a serious way. In the years ahead, the connection between student development and the professional development of faculty will become an especially important nexus of opportunity and challenge.

Relating to the External World of Work

A third linkage or connection that needs to be made in the days ahead has to do with relating faculty more effectively to that external world frequently referred to as the "world of work," or worse, the "real world." The descriptions depict the problem. Faculty need to develop a new appreciation for and involvement in the world beyond the campus.

During the expansionist days, faculty lost connection with larger societal purposes. The disconnectedness had a lot to do with the rapidity of growth, high levels of specialization, and the estrangement

There is a developmental need to re-establish that connection, that wider sense of belonging, of being generative in society.

of the 1960s. It was also a reflection of the incredible opportunities in higher education. Most faculty moved from scholarship, to appointment, to promotion, and finally to tenure, with little difficulty. Some mid-career faculty have not been off-campus since kindergarten. For them, that other world is a thing apart. There is a developmental need to re-establish that connection, that wider sense of belonging, of being generative in society. There is also an instructional and curricular need to have faculty — faculty in the liberal arts especially — who can relate the substance of their academic fields to meaningful work in that external world. The report on the Foundation's grant series entitled "Balancing Career Preparation and Liberal Learning" describes several projects that focus directly on this connection (available from the Foundation on request).

The walls between college and that external world need to become more permeable, without losing what is distinctive about preparation in a scholarly tradition. The projects at the University of Puget Sound and through the Council of Independent Colleges struggled with this issue, experienced substantial resistance, but made notable gains.

Two other developments in the society at-large have special significance for the relationship of the academy to that external world. The first has to do with what Harold (Bud) Hodgkinson refers to as "the disaggregation of the post-secondary education market." Three times as many adults are being educated outside of colleges and universities as inside. Post-secondary education is being fundamentally altered and institutions of higher education need to prepare to respond to this challenge. A second development has to do with the growth and recognition of the "independent scholar." Substantial numbers of Ph.D.'s (in the social sciences and humanities, particularly) are functioning as productive scholars outside of, and on the margins of, colleges and universities. They often serve as part-time

or adjunct faculty and their numbers are becoming increasingly significant to post-secondary education.

These important developments, along with others, are going to increase the flow of research and teaching between formal institutions of higher education and external work settings and create for those interested in maintaining faculty vitality new problems and opportunities.

The Link to Academic Planning and Institutional Policies

As faculty development moves from the periphery of colleges and universities to the center, the most crucial linkage is to long-range planning and institutional development. Despite all the recent excitement about the "information revolution" and its impact on higher education, the quality of colleges and universities will continue to depend on the motivation and commitment of faculty. The faculty who are now in mid-career will continue for some time to be the primary resource available for adapting to the challenges and strains of changing conditions in the years ahead. Given this context, institutional vitality will require the imaginative linking of the professional development of individual faculty with the carefully planned development of academic programs and institutional policies.

Institutions of higher education have not been very effective at long-range planning. In fact, many of the problems burdening academic programs today could have been averted with better informed, anticipatory planning. The Foundation's grant to Concordia College is a part of a much larger, on-going effort to address this issue. Concordia is developing a comprehensive program aimed at coordinating academic planning and professional development. The accom-

Many of the existing policies that monitor and reward faculty activity have hardened into rules which stifle rather than enhance faculty growth.

plishments at Concordia are being sustained by resources from other foundations and deserve widespread attention.

Of special importance is the restructuring of institutional policies affecting faculty careers. Most of these policies are based on the assumption that faculty develop best by building on what they have already done well, by continuing to narrow their specialization. What is needed most by faculty in mid-career are not only new, but different opportunities and options that are acknowledged as legitimate and duly rewarded. Many of the existing policies that monitor and reward faculty activity have hardened into rules which stifle rather than enhance faculty growth. A serious reassessment is called for; fresh ideas and a new approach appropriate to what are radically altered circumstances are required.

Final Observations

The Northwest Area Foundation has made a substantial investment in efforts to maintain the vitality of faculty in the region's colleges and universities. This endeavor has included not only the funding of individual institutions and consortia, but the bringing together of leaders and practitioners for reflection on the merits of the various strategies, the exchange of ideas, and critique. Much has been learned; the following observations stand out.

Mixed Purposes: Development and/or Retrenchment

In a time when many institutions of higher education are engaged in retrenchment, there is much concern among faculty about whether activities sponsored under the rubric of faculty development are for the purposes of professional enhancement and personal growth or are a smoke screen masking preparation for staff reduction. Resistance or what seems to be disinterest on the part of the faculty is often generated by this concern. It is imperative that faculty be fully involved in the initial planning and execution of all faculty renewal activities. In the climate that now exists, administrative initiative without the direct involvement of faculty is suspect.

The one-dimensional conception of the academic career that continues to dominate the profession makes the consideration of new opportunities for growth and change profoundly threatening. If higher education can get beyond what Seymour Sarason has called

the "one-life, one career imperative" and can move toward a multidimensional understanding of the academic career, genuine growth and development need not be seen as antithetical to the realignment of institutional priorities. Institutional change can provide new options for the professional growth of individuals. In the effort to sus-

It is imperative that faculty be fully involved in the initial planning and execution of all faculty renewal activities. In the climate that now exists, administrative initiative without the direct involvement of faculty is suspect.

tain the quality and commitment of faculty, however, both administrators and faculty need to be fully aware of the relationship between the developmental concerns for the individual and the pressures on the institution for retrenchment.

Faculty Age and Career Stage

In the conclusion of his provocative study of *The American Academic Profession* (Ohio State University Press, 1984), Martin Finkelstein argues that: "Age is the single most important source of individual change over the course of the academic career." This contention is most persuasive when applied to men in mid-career who have followed a traditional academic career path. It is less applicable to women in higher education and the increasing number of men who are choosing academic work as a second or third career. The recent work in adult development which focuses on age has been useful, however, in understanding and responding to the needs of faculty in mid-life where, in fact, the majority of faculty are at present.

In the attempt to maintain faculty vitality, career stage (whether correlated with age or not) has proven to be particularly important. What is needed by faculty in mid-career is significantly different from that which encourages professional growth among new faculty. And only now is attention being paid to the special circumstances of older

faculty in the later stages of their careers. Different strategies are required to address effectively the needs of faculty at different career stages.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association recently received a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education to address the unique problems of new faculty in liberal arts colleges. Data on new faculty are being systematically gathered and institutional policies designed specifically to meet the particular needs of faculty in the early stages of their careers are being devised. Research on the development of careers in other organizational settings (e.g., corporation managers) is proving to be useful in understanding and addressing the needs of faculty at the various career stages.

Career Planning and Redirection

Formal arrangements to facilitate career planning have not had an established place in the lives of faculty in the past. What was required to move ahead with one's career was clearly ascribed in the professional culture and opportunities were available for those who lived up to expectations. For many faculty that situation has changed dramatically. Faculty in increasing numbers are feeling "stuck" and wanting alternatives or are being forced to explore options within their institutions or outside of higher education altogether. In the years ahead, opportunities for career planning are going to become increasingly necessary and sought after.

During the short time that has passed since the projects described here were proposed, there has emerged a new readiness on the part of faculty to attend to issues related to career development. The "Alternative Careers" project of the Council of Independent Colleges would be much more acceptable now, as originally proposed, than it was four years ago.

Programs and procedures designed to provide new career direction for faculty such as the retraining and respecialization programs of Saint Scholastica, Mary College, and within the Montana University System are going to take on new importance as enrollments continue to shrink and institutions seek for new ways to utilize their existing faculty resources. The smaller institutions in this grant series were able to make use of this strategy much more readily than the larger schools. The demand for high levels of specialization, the

length to which departments and schools will go to protect their "turf," and the stumbling blocks built into more complex, bureaucratic systems make the transfer into new or even adjacent areas of academic responsibility especially difficult. If procedures can be restructured and precedents established, the transition for faculty who come along subsequently will be much easier and the experience will have greater potential for being revitalizing rather than alienating.

Faculty Rewards: Intrinsic and Extrinsic

There has long been the assumption in higher education and the society that the intrinsic rewards faculty received from their teaching and research — intellectual challenge, variety, wholeness, autonomy, and control over their work — more than adequately compensated for the lack of extrinsic pay-off characteristic of other professions. Earlier studies of job satisfaction indicated that this assumption was justified. There is evidence now that because of the decline in salary, increased workload, limited opportunity structure, and the deterioration of working conditions (extrinsic rewards) this assumption can no longer be made.

One of the lessons learned from the evaluations in this grant series is that greater attention needs to be paid to the link between what is expected of faculty and the reward structure.

The balance between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards is a delicate one. Vital faculty are the ones who receive intrinsic satisfaction from their work, but if the extrinsic characteristics continue to erode the intrinsic rewards will not be enough. One of the lessons learned from the evaluations in this grant series is that greater attention needs to be paid to the link between what is expected of faculty and the reward structure. That connection ought to be made more explicit and direct. The satisfaction that a faculty member gets from his or her teaching and scholarly pursuits should be grounded in strong internal com-

mitments and priorities, but attention needs to be paid to the dissatisfaction that can be generated by the deterioration of the extrinsic characteristics of academic work.

Relating the Personal and the Professional

Over the past decade, efforts at faculty development have been plagued by the relationships between the personal and the professional. Much of this has to do with the kinds of people attracted to academic life. On the one hand, faculty members prize their autonomy and value their privacy. On the other hand, they are caring people for whom relationships are central. The quality of their relational life can have a direct impact on the quality of their work. Also, the nature of academic work makes it difficult to maintain boundaries between the personal and the professional, leisure and work, family and job. There is strong resistance to efforts to address this issue, but also significant need.

In this grant series, there were only limited forays into this sensitive territory. The most successful was the conference sponsored by the North Dakota Board of Higher Education on "Life Transitions." The program was grounded in the recent research on adult development and spoke directly to the transitions and developmental tasks with which faculty are now struggling.

An issue that is especially pressing for faculty in the northwest region and is not being addressed has to do with the dual career family. Because so many of the colleges and universities in the region are located in small towns in rural areas, the population base is not substantial enough to provide challenging employment to the spouses of faculty with career aspirations. This is a discouraging factor in the recruitment of new faculty and a growing problem for couples in mid-life where the spouse is electing (sometimes out of necessity) to re-enter the paid labor force. This issue is profoundly disruptive in the lives of faculty and is not receiving the attention it deserves.

Funding Strategy:
Single Institutions or Consortium

The Faculty Vitality grant series provided a special opportunity to assess the relative merits of two different funding strategies. Are

faculty development activities best supported through the funding of individual institutions or through awards to consortia? The inter-institutional approach proved to be most successful when the linking institutions were fairly homogenous (having common structures and missions) and had come together around tasks held in high regard by all participating institutions (e.g., Iowa Liberal Arts Project). The consortium approach was also to be preferred when the developmental tasks faculty were asked to pursue required confidentiality and a neutral space removed from personnel decisions being made on one's home campus (the consideration of alternative careers and career planning are examples).

Where the consortium itself is fragile, the faculty development activity usually is given low priority and has very little chance of surviving beyond the grant period. The merit of funding state-wide systems is that they often have a permanent staff and are on-going. Given the budgetary problems in most of the states in the region, however, building funding committed to maintaining faculty vitality into established budgets is difficult.

A major advantage of funding individual institutions is that faculty development activities can be tied directly to the college or university's reward system, institutional policies, and long-range planning; they can be built into the primary support structures of the institution. In individual institutions faculty development and curriculum development can go hand-in-hand, each serving as a resource for the other.

If this grant series is any indication, the continuation of projects after the funding supplied by the Foundation has ended is more likely if the grant has been made to an individual institution. Few consortia have provisions for funding new programs initiated by monies from external sources. On the other hand, cooperative endeavors can provide the "critical mass" necessary for getting a new initiative under way and can minimize the risk that often goes with projects that have not been tried, but hold promise.

A Multi-Dimensional Approach to Academic Careers

If there is one theme that stands out in this assessment of the Faculty Vitality series, it is that there is no "one best way" to maintain a growing, dynamic faculty. It is important that the traditional avenues

If there is one theme that stands out in this assessment of the Faculty Vitality series, it is that there is no "one best way" to maintain a growing, dynamic faculty.

of professional development be sustained, that sabbatical leaves, research support, and provision for attendance at professional meetings continue to be made. It is clear, however, that to perpetuate the familiar, a one-dimensional conception of an earlier time, is not enough. Ways must be found to build out of the new but difficult conditions we now face a variety of career paths and options within higher education that will keep faculty members intellectually alive and committed to the important tasks of teaching, research, and service. Perhaps it will mean opening the doors of colleges and universities in a way that will enable those with the best talent and the strongest commitments to move in and out of academic careers, without assuming that an affiliation with the academy is for life. Perhaps it will involve a radically altered conception of what it means to be a scholar in a democracy. Reward systems and the structure of the academic career as we have known it must certainly change.

John Kenneth Galbraith takes pleasure in reminding us that "Everyone is a genius in a bull market." The conditions we face in higher education over the next decade are anything but bullish. Maintaining the vitality of faculty in the years ahead will not be easy. Imagination, thoughtful planning, and significant investment in the most versatile resource the college and university has are going to be required. The vitality of higher education itself depends on it.

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

In 1980, William C. Nelsen completed a thorough study of *Effective Approaches to Faculty Development*. One of his findings is that faculty development programs have not been monitored very carefully or systematically evaluated. The Faculty Vitality series had program evaluation built into the projects from the beginning.

Each project had its own external evaluator chosen jointly by the grant recipient and the Foundation's consultant for program evaluation. The external evaluators for this series were especially well-qualified for the task, combining years of direct experience in faculty development with expertise in evaluation.

In addition to the annual evaluations of the external evaluators, each project was visited by Martha G. Butt, Vice President of the Foundation, and R. Eugene Rice, the Foundation's consultant for program evaluation. The site visits were important not only because they provided another perspective from which to assess the program; they also served to lend visibility to the projects on campus, to keep the funded programs on schedule, and to provide both information and support for the project directors.

An important part of the evaluation process was the meetings of the project directors that were convened annually in Saint Paul. These meetings focused on both the mid-course assessment of program content and process as well as the evaluation procedures. Nationally prominent leaders in the field of faculty development made presentations and assisted in the formative assessment of the projects. William Nelsen, David Halliburton, and William Bergquist played key roles in these annual sessions. The most valuable part of

the meetings was the regular opportunity for the project directors to share their problems and achievements with others struggling with similar tasks. The exchange of information and resources and the building of a network of support were particularly useful. That kind of contact has the potential for being beneficial to the institutions and individuals involved long after the Foundation's grant series has run its course.

In the third year of the grant series, a two-day invitational conference, entitled "Strategies for Maintaining Faculty and Institutional Vitality," was sponsored by the Foundation at the Spring Hill Conference Center in Wayzata, Minnesota. Participants in the conference included representatives of foundations and agencies prominent in the funding of faculty development projects (e.g., Bush, Kellogg, Ford, and The Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education). National associations that have provided leadership in the field were also represented (e.g., American Association of Higher Education, Council of Independent Colleges, American Association of Colleges, and American Sociological Association). The project directors and external evaluators of the Northwest Area Foundation's grants also attended and played an active role. A report on the conference was published in the Foundation's *Newsletter* (Winter, 1982–83).

ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Carleton College, Saint Olaf College

Northfield, Minnesota 55057

Title of project: Faculty Vitality in International Studies

Contact person: Peter W. Stanley, former Dean, Carleton College, now with Ford Foundation, New York, New York

External evaluator: Mojmir Povolny, Henry W. Wriston Professor in the Social Sciences and former Dean of the University Faculty, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin

Project description: The program sought to strengthen the competence of faculty at the two colleges who were primarily concerned with the study of other nations and cultures. Each year, four summer research grants to individuals led to a week-long workshop or seminar involving 10 to 20 additional faculty from the two colleges. The research scholars and distinguished visiting speakers in the relevant fields also conducted symposia at the two colleges for a general audience of faculty, students, and townspeople. Important objectives were to keep faculty current in their fields, build networks of exchange and communication among faculty at the two colleges, spread interest in the relevant subjects on the two campuses, and work towards more efficient use of resources by strengthening cooperation.

Project director's comments: The overall concept and strategy have worked well. At bottom, we have been trying to combat the isolation of the scholar-teacher who is the only person concerned with his or her immediate field in a small college. The project depended upon the proximity and mutual respect of the two colleges, which are located only a mile apart in a small Minnesota town. Support from the two administrations has been very important. The chief difficul-

ties involved implementation. Potential conflicts of interest arose because, in small colleges, the faculty administering the program in any given year were also among those best qualified for research grants. Also, in the first year of the program, coordination of the summer research projects with the broader interests of the faculty involved in the workshop/seminar proved difficult. We solved the potential conflict of interest problem by expanding the role of the oversight committee, including the Deans of both colleges, which was composed entirely of senior scholars ineligible to apply for grants. Once this had been done, we allowed faculty serving on the administrative committee for any given year to apply for research grants as well. The oversight committee also took it upon itself to improve coordination between research grants and workshops by making this one of its criteria for granting research awards. The project has been a considerable success in helping selected faculty carry out research related to their teaching and to the broader interests of their colleagues. The workshop symposium has become, in the last two years, a very stimulating forum, engaging faculty from many fields and from both colleges. The symposia have been of mixed success, varying with the topic, the speaker, and the amount of advance preparation. Networking among faculty of the two colleges has definitely occurred, but probably not as much as we had hoped. The growing involvement of students, many of whom undertook research projects of their own as adjuncts to this program, has been outstanding. If we were to do this project again, we would greatly simplify the administrative structure and be much less prescriptive about specific activities.

College of Saint Scholastica

Duluth, Minnesota 55811

Title of project: Faculty Vitality Program

Contact person: Sister Mary Odile Cahoon, Senior Vice President and Dean of the College

External evaluator: Joyce T. Povlacs, Faculty Instructional Consultant, Teaching and Learning Center, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska

Project description: The program was designed to expand the expertise of faculty who were teaching lighter loads because of changes in trends of course registrations. The College planned to reduce part-time faculty as full-time faculty became competent to take over new areas of teaching. The faculty participants were expected to continue

teaching in the original field as well as expanding to a new field of specialization.

Project director's comments: The project met the needs of the College as well as gave opportunities for a limited number of faculty to pursue study in areas of interest. Other faculty have become interested in the possibility of expanding expertise and have found other funding or have funded further study themselves. If we were to do the project again, we might build in more flexibility so that the faculty would not worry initially about a shift in program if such a shift seemed beneficial to both the individual and the College. We would also plan for dissemination of information. A key factor in the success of the program was the readiness of the faculty to broaden their fields. It would be very undesirable to use any sort of pressure on faculty to move into other fields. Providing a salary as well as covering educational costs was very important in enabling faculty participation. This type of project might be most successful in smaller schools where there is much interdepartmental exchange.

Colleges of Mid-America

Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57101

Title of project: Renewed Faculty for New Learner
Contact person: Richard Dunfey, Executive Director
External evaluator: Don Cannon, Executive Director, Northern Plains Consortium, Jamestown, North Dakota

Project description: This retraining program was designed to move faculty and thus institutions into a more client (student)-centered posture as they sought to develop curriculum, alter instructional methodologies, and modify institutional services for adults. The program worked to develop consortium continuing education plans utilizing resources of a number of institutions to meet identified needs.

Project director's comments: The project exceeded all expectations for enrollment, change, and non-traditional student service delivery. Eight campuses appointed continuing adult education directors, 50 courses were introduced and 84 courses were redesigned, and non-traditional student enrollments increased by 20 percent. The program is continuing on all campuses with institutional support. The biggest problem faced during implementation related to the fact that personnel time commitment required for program introduction on the campuses exceeded original expectations. The colleges should have been asked to make full-time appointments. In order to

strengthen the project, the consortium office should have developed more specific job descriptions for campus personnel to be distributed at the beginning of the project. Competition among the campuses for successful program implementation was important in accomplishing the project goals.

Concordia College

Moorhead, Minnesota 56560

Title of project: Faculty Development/Vitality Program

Contact person: David M. Gring, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College

External evaluator: Joe Elmore, formerly Provost, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana

Project description: The project involved an examination of various modifications of the faculty development programs developed at the college, for purposes of strengthening their best features. The objectives included developing the role of the academic department as an integral part of the long-range planning process by focusing its role as facilitators of faculty development; establishing a grant program model of faculty growth and development; utilizing an already established Faculty Center to coordinate faculty development; and analyzing and developing personnel policies relating to faculty composition, tenure, mobility, and retirement.

Project director's comments: Faculty interest in departmental self-studies was considerably greater than we had anticipated. As a result of the project we developed some evaluation and assessment measures, including one which allows for a more accurate determining of faculty priorities in development practices. We are really not sure that projects are transportable. Our advice to other institutions would be to develop their own packaging of components, allowing the faculty to determine what the priorities and needs really are.

Council of Independent Colleges

(formerly, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges)
Washington, D.C. 20036

Title of project: In Support of Career Planning and Development (formerly, In Support of Alternate Careers)

Contact person: Gary H. Quehl, President, The Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, D.C.

External evaluator: Nancy Tapper Hanawi, Executive Vice President, Center for Social Redesign, Oakland, California

Project description: This project attempted to develop administrative and institutional policies and practices in support of faculty and administrator career transitions to non-academic employment and to provide training and support to faculty and administrators as they sought to make career transitions. Seven core workshops, intended to provide participants from CIC member institutions with a basic experience in life and career planning, were offered during the second phase of the project. Attendees were then eligible to participate in any of five follow-up workshops: basic management training, interpersonal and group skills, job seeking, financial planning, and a couples workshop.

Project director's comments: Extreme sensitivity is needed to deal with this issue. This became evident when only 11 of the 27 eligible institutions were present at the first conference. A major concern of the conference focused on the name and scope of the program. Participants expressed much concern about the administrators' role in recruitment or selection of faculty to engage in the training to seek an alternate career. Although a total of 188 participants attended the workshops — well above the planned 135 — faculty essentially participated on an individual rather than an institutional basis. The unexpected consequences of the project were: evidence that the best way to "market" staff development is via people who have had successful experiences; the importance of directing the program to couples as well as individuals; and the unique way that institutions were impacted other than by policy implementation. The most critical need in a similar project is early peer involvement. It would probably have improved recruitment, workshop design and delivery, and institutionalization. Most important of all, it would have dealt with the concern that the proposal unintentionally focused on a threat to faculty and staff. This type of project would be most successful if it were individual rather than institution-based. Faculty want to participate, but they do not want to have their institutions regard this as a specific policy-making area. Support systems need to be developed for total decision-making process. Individuals found themselves with no support following the decision. The fact that the component designed to induce institutional change failed to fully meet its objective does not mean that institutions were not impacted. Many comments from individual participants reveal results which affected teaching, attitudes about teaching and about personal development, and rela-

tionships with colleagues and administrators. All these can profoundly alter the climate of an institution, particularly if, as in several cases, a substantial number of faculty have participated.

Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa 50112
Central College
Pella, Iowa 50219
Simpson College
Indianola, Iowa 50125
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Title of project: Seminars in the Liberal Arts

Contact person: Catherine S. Frazer, Dean of the Faculty, Grinnell College

External evaluator: Jon W. Fuller, President, Great Lakes Colleges Association, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Project description: This was a multi-institutional program of summer seminars designed to offer instruction in various liberal arts disciplines for faculty members to study areas outside their own specialty. This opportunity to broaden the individual instructor's perspective was intended to revitalize both the individual faculty member and the general education offerings in each school.

Project director's comments: The practical outcomes of this project are highlighted by the actual exposure to new fields of study for 188 faculty members in four institutions. This in itself is a remarkable achievement in terms of renewed intellectual vitality for a core group of faculty on each campus. The new respect with which the other campuses and new colleagues were viewed is almost equally important. Less easy to measure is the direct classroom application of new insights, but responses from the majority of participants make clear their intent to incorporate the insights gained in a variety of ways. The most important consequence not specifically foreseen in the initial proposal was the close working relationship established among the four deans. This has opened the door to a variety of mutual institutional interests. The willingness of the administrators to keep actively involved, especially in the selection of faculty seminar leaders, was the key to our quality control. All of us would recommend providing some such structure. The success of the project also of course

depends on the willingness of faculty to explore outside their own disciplines. The use of a stipend to encourage such exploration is of obvious importance, given the many demands on faculty time. The project will not be continued in this form, largely because the three-year period did allow each institution to include virtually all interested faculty participants in at least one seminar. Our experience has been that it is wiser to move on to new forms of faculty development rather than to replicate with a very small group.

Linfield College

McMinnville, Oregon 87128

Contact person: J. Frank Bumpus, Professor of Psychology

External evaluator: David Whitcomb, Director of Faculty Development, California State University, Long Beach, California

Project description: The project expanded Linfield's faculty development program by assisting faculty to assess and enhance their career development and preparing faculty members to work more effectively with the growing number of adult students in off-campus programs. A variety of training workshops were held, individual career-development consulting was provided, and professional development grants were awarded to 17 faculty members.

Project director's comments: The renewal and vitality of participating faculty has been obvious. A somewhat unexpected benefit involved the professors who were consultants to the 17 faculty who received the professional development grants. Each grant applicant was required to have three self-selected "consultant/advisors" in applying for and planning the use of the funds. These faculty were enthused and seemingly motivated by the efforts of the actual 17 recipients. This dissemination of scholarly development and its very diverse impact on the people involved seemed to increase colleagues' professional activity. Many of these grants to individual faculty served to support them in moving in rather new directions of specialization. Considerable revitalization seemed to occur with these new perspectives/teaching skills/knowledge. Among the suggestions we would offer to another institution attempting a similar project: 1. Make all activities voluntary. We resisted any effort to "improve the dead wood." However, key colleagues should encourage faculty to seek such improvement grants when those faculty are unlikely to be the first to jump at grants available. We did not want these resources to be seen as still another plum for the rather small per-

centage of faculty who always seek such attractive grants. Utilizing senior faculty on the steering committee was very useful. 2. Structure all activities so they are accountable to a steering committee which assists grant directors. We tried to convey the impression that all functions of the overall grant were flowing from a rather broad-based set of individuals. 3. Place at least one trustee on the committee which is responsible for these activities and bring that person to campus as much as possible. 4. Possible uses of these funds should be very diverse. Applicants should follow a prescribed form and process in seeking the grants. Recipients should be selected by another agency than the grant director, steering committee, or academic dean. Our recipients were selected by a representative, standing faculty committee.

Mary College

Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Title of project: Re-education of Faculty

Contact person: Thomas P. Johnson, Vice President for Academic Affairs

External evaluator: Ron Brockway, Professor of History, Regis College, Denver, Colorado

Project description: The objective of this project was to re-educate under-utilized faculty so that they are able to serve other roles in the college. Through the use of internships, graduate courses, workshops, institutes, and self-directed learning experiences, these faculty prepared to teach in other academic disciplines and to participate in non-instructional roles in the college.

Project director's comments: This project had tremendous impact on the improvement of faculty utilization which, in turn, had significant financial implications. Students benefited by having available a wider range of course options. Most participants experienced a revitalization through the process of new learning, although a few felt "put upon" because they were asked to carry a heavier load than they had been accustomed to. If we were to do the project again, more use would be made of formal graduate classes and workshops during the summer. Re-education in a secondary academic area would be a more significant part of the program with less emphasis on administrative roles.

Marylhurst College for Lifelong Learning

Marylhurst, Oregon 97036

Title of project: Faculty Development in a Non-Traditional Setting

Contact person: Ludmilla Monson, Vice President for Academic Affairs

External evaluator: J. Wesley Brown, Senior Tutor, Para College, Saint Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota

Project description: The goal of this project was to implement an integrated program for faculty development in a non-traditional college. The objectives included assessing the needs of part-time faculty as well as full-time faculty and staff and developing an action plan. The primary purpose of the grant was to prepare its faculty for the new mission of the institution — educating the adult learner.

Project director's comments: There still remains a real need for a more complete project for faculty development in a non-traditional setting. Part-time faculty were initially used because of financial restraints. We have learned through our experience with them that they contribute vitality, expertise, and have "hands-on" experience that adds greatly to our overall capability to serve adult learners. If this type of project were done by another institution, we would advise them to spend time in faculty orientation and get input from faculty prior to writing the proposal. Top administrative support is essential, and the project must be facilitative and not be imposed on the faculty.

Montana University System

Helena, Montana 59620

Title of project: Faculty Vitality Project

Contact person: Caroll Krause, Deputy Commissioner, Academic Affairs

External evaluator: William Bergquist, Director of the Center for Organizational Studies, The Wright Institute, Berkeley, California; Jack LaTrielle, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana

Project description: The project was designed to address problems associated with retrenchment, low faculty morale, and academic stagnation. The goal of the project was the regeneration of faculty vitality with the specific objectives of developing faculty exchanges; providing for faculty reallocation and development; and revision of

existing academic programs and development of new programs to utilize faculty.

Project director's comments: Individuals who received grants benefited substantially from their activities. An evaluation team was trained and experienced considerable personal growth from the evaluation process. System-wide, cooperation between the various institutions was enhanced. While the total project was successful, it did not result in a formal plan for faculty vitality for the institutions or the system as had been desired. If we were to do the project again, we would want to commit more funds to administration and coordination. Only a small amount was spent on administration. This resulted in too many loose ends. Administrative decisions were reactive rather than proactive. Full-time coordinators for such a project are essential.

Mount Mercy College

Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402

Title of project: Faculty Development Program

Contact person: Robert K. McMaster, Director of Faculty Development and the Weekend College

External evaluator: Sandy Inglis, Dean, California School of Professional Psychology, San Francisco, California

Project description: The faculty development program was planned to promote the professional growth of the faculty members as teachers, scholars, and members of the community created by a small liberal arts college. These objectives were to be achieved by providing consultation services that would assist faculty in writing growth contracts as well as in other areas relating to teaching and scholarship; publishing a monthly newsletter; arranging for workshops to be held on campus; sponsoring regular "lunch and learning" sessions; providing funding for professional travel and projects; and purchasing equipment and materials that promote professional growth.

Project director's comments: The major problem we had was finding a person from outside the college to direct the program. Since it was a three-year grant, there was no guarantee that the person would be retained beyond that period. After we hired an internal person, the program was successful and I think will continue to be so. If we were to do the project again, I'd hire a person from within the college on a limited basis and then attempt to rotate willing faculty members into

the position every three years. This way the program would retain credibility, continuity, and also promote the development of the faculty member who takes the position. I would advise the following:

1) involve faculty in the planning stage; 2) in the beginning seek a respected and interested faculty member to direct the program; you can always seek an outside person once the program establishes credibility; 3) have adequate funding available; 4) identify faculty needs and strive to meet them; 5) have strong, visible, and vocal administrative support. We evaluated the project primarily by looking at the faculty's perception of its success and looking at their behavior with regard to development activities. We found that faculty were reluctant to voluntarily write growth contracts, but were receptive to the other aspects of the project. Over 90 percent of the faculty participated in some way in the program.

North Dakota State Board of Higher Education

Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

Title of project: Faculty Revitalization and Development Workshops

Contact person: Richard L. Davison, Associate Commissioner

External evaluator: John A. Seeley, Formative Evaluation Research Associates, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Project description: The North Dakota State Board of Higher Education designed and conducted a series of five faculty development seminars for locally selected faculty from every institution of higher education in the state. The goal of the seminar was to stimulate faculty to reconsider the nature, purpose, content, and methodology of higher education and the role of each discipline.

Project director's comments: If we were to do the project again, we would spend more time with a faculty and administrative advisory committee on dates, selection of speakers, and topics. The academic officers and representative faculty should be continuously involved rather than as an "input" advisory group.

Southwest West Central Consortium:

Southwest State University, Marshall, Minnesota 56258

University of Minnesota at Morris, Morris, Minnesota 56267

Willmar Community College, Willmar, Minnesota 56201

Worthington Community College, Worthington, Minnesota 56187

Title of project: Faculty Vitality Project

Contact person: Karla Klinger, Program Director, Morris Learning Center

External evaluator: Colman O'Connell, Director of Planning, College of Saint Benedict, Saint Joseph, Minnesota

Project description: The objectives of the project were: 1) To assess whether faculty involvement in cooperative institutional activities can overcome professional isolation that can be experienced in rural campuses; 2) To identify promising potential areas for faculty cooperation; 3) To learn faculty perspectives of their professional growth needs; 4) To provide opportunities for faculty to shape cooperative relationships; 5) To utilize cooperative activities as a basis for developing joint programs; 6) To establish an on-going process for stimulating faculty vitality among consortium faculty. Project funds were assigned to three annual retreats involving faculty and administrators from the four institutions and to monetary awards to faculty for cooperative mini-grant activities.

Project director's comments: The administrative office of the Southwest West Central Consortium which administered the grant was eliminated due to financial constraints at the end of 1981. The four cooperating institutions wrote an administrative agreement and contributed funds so that the project could continue. The University of Minnesota, Morris, agreed to be the fiscal agent. A part-time coordinator was hired to replace the consortium director. For a project like this to succeed, support of key faculty and chief academic officers is essential, as is a project coordinator. Faculty who fill this role must be assigned a reduced instructional appointment. If we were to do the project again, I would have considered having a series of smaller retreats in addition to the large expensive retreat. The greatest compliment we can give to the project is that the faculty who were involved in it want it to continue. Plans for continuation of cooperative efforts are drafted.

University of Puget Sound

Tacoma, Washington 98416

Title of project: Careers in Transition

Contact person: Gary L. Peterson, Department Chair, Communication and Theater Arts

External evaluator: Stephen Scholl, Dean of School of Liberal and Professional Arts, J. F. Kennedy University, Orinda, California

Project description: The Careers in Transition program was designed to assist faculty in three primary areas: exploration of career opportunities in non-academic settings; preparation for the transition into retirement; attention to personal development changes as they affect life and career planning. Five program components were prepared to meet these goals: 1) faculty internships; 2) intensive business course; 3) workshops in personal planning; 4) job placement services; and 5) individual counseling.

Project director's comments: This kind of project would succeed best where the institutional climate is supportive, where professional development is an opportunity and not a threat. I do not believe size or type of institution would make as much difference as the overall commitment of that institution to providing faculty/professional development for its employees. As this project was implemented, there was a decline in the emphasis on career changing or leaving academia. Faculty were found to be much more approachable with the broader idea of life and career planning. Once engaged in such planning, then some faculty were receptive to exploration of alternate careers. If we were to do the project again, more faculty would be involved as a steering committee, from the writing of the proposal through the evaluation. Departmental units would be involved more directly and extensively. Program components which became operational as part of university policy would be given more publicity; the business course, if offered at all for our own faculty, would be offered in the latter stages of the program, after faculty had clearer ideas of their needs or interests in taking such a course; and we would deemphasize, from the outset, the career shift or the moving out of academe. Our recommendations to others planning such a program would include the following: Programs should have faculty support and ownership from the beginning; career development should not issue as an administrative command. Career development should be regarded as an integral part of professional development, and not as "outplacement" of faculty. Career development opportunities should receive wide publicity. Program directors or coordinators ought to be faculty peers — or at least a person accepted and credible with faculty. Any career development plan at an institution needs to be adapted to the specific environment and culture at that institution. Models are useful and should be utilized, but care should be taken to make operations flexible enough to address local needs and policies. Exposure to business administration or similar courses is probably best left to individuals to determine as they assess their own priori-

ties. Faculty internships are strongly recommended as a way to provide a window of non-academic experience for the professor. In addition to the value to the individual faculty member, there are many subtle but significant public relations advantages for the educational institution. Personal career development or professional development plans have much potential; it is possible to integrate them into already existing programs of leave, research, and faculty development. Ideally, career development will need to be implemented at the departmental or similar administrative unit. Faculty members do not develop their careers, attempt changes, and explore options without affecting their colleagues and their curricular-research environments. It is recommended that departmental personnel plan together, help prepare and approve individual plans, and that, together, individual plans be integrated into a departmental goal.

Winona Tri-College/University Consortium

Saint Mary's College
College of Saint Teresa
Winona State University
Winona, Minnesota 55987

Title of project: Cooperative Faculty Development

Contact person: Sister Johanna Orlett, Office of Institutional Research, College of Saint Teresa, Winona, Minnesota

External evaluator: George Brushaber, President, Bethel College, Saint Paul, Minnesota; Dora Marcus, Evaluation Associate, Office of the Dean, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Project description: This consortium project had the following objectives: 1) the improvement of instruction; 2) preparation for alternate careers and for retirement; 3) personal and professional enrichment of faculty members; 4) the support of individual research through incentive grants; and 5) faculty internships in business, industry, and government services. The project was administered by an executive committee consisting of a coordinator from each institution, with one serving as project director. This group worked with five committees made up of faculty members from the three institutions. Each of these implementing committees planned activities in support of one of the development objectives listed above.

Project director's comments: Of 450 faculty members in our consortium, about 80 percent have engaged in some activity in the faculty

development program. If we were to do the project again we would do these things differently: 1) Carry out the initial needs and interest assessment for development activities through established groups on the campuses with which faculty members already identify (perhaps department and division), rather than as an open mailing from administrators of a new program; 2) Replace the second committee, "Alternate Career and Retirement Planning," with one entitled "Life and Career Planning"; and 3) Work more directly to coordinate this program with the faculty development programs already in place at each of the three institutions. We would plan to have more funds reserved for the incentive grants for individual faculty projects. We would recommend that the administrators of a project such as ours publish a program booklet giving precise information about project activities, their availability to faculty members, criteria for funding of projects, scheduled dates for decision-making about funding, and the names and telephone numbers of all personnel connected with the project. Wide distribution of the progress reports among administrators of the consortium helps to keep the program visible and results in high continued support.

RESOURCES

The literature on the professional development of faculty continues to grow. Most of the significant work up to 1978 is identified and thoughtfully annotated in Sally S. Gaff, Conrad Festa, and Jerry G. Gaff, *Professional Development: A Guide to Resources* (New York: Change Magazine Press, 1978). Another comprehensive review of the literature is B. Stordahl, "Faculty Development: A Survey of Literature of the Seventies" (*AAHE Bulletin*, 1981, 33 (7), 7–10). The resources selected for mention here are those that are the most current and were particularly influential in shaping the perspective that informed the assessment of this grant series.

General. For a well-informed statement on the impact of current conditions on the lives of faculty, see Roger G. Baldwin and Robert T. Blackburn, eds., *College Faculty: Versatile Human Resources in a Period of Constraint* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1983). This collection of essays is based on the recent research coming out of the major centers for the study of higher education. The articles by Baldwin and Blackburn, McKeachie, and Toombs provide good background and the essays by Nelsen and Patton make concrete proposals for addressing the changing needs of faculty.

Martin J. Finkelstein, *The American Academic Profession*, was recently published by Ohio State University Press. The chapters on "Faculty at Work" and "Women and Minority Faculty" are especially helpful. For comprehensive data on faculty, this book is a major reference source.

Ann E. Austin and Zelda F. Gamson, *Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions* (AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10, Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1983) focuses on the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions in faculty work. The "Conclusions and Recom-

mendations" found in the last chapter of the book are grounded in solid research and identify serious strains in the faculty career. A number of the most recent AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Reports deal with faculty related issues: Brookes and German, *Meeting the Challenges: Developing Faculty Careers* (No. 3, 1983) and Meléndez and Guzmán, *Burnout: The New Academic Disease* (No. 9, 1983) stand out.

The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education sponsors an annual publication under the title *To Improve the Academy*. Most of the articles published there are by faculty development practitioners, those who are directly engaged in efforts to maintain faculty vitality (often deans or faculty members themselves). For the specific application of strategies appropriate to faculty development, this publication is a most useful resource.

A Developmental Approach. Efforts at faculty development must be grounded in the best that we know about human development generally. Much of the most recent developmental work has been drawn together and applied to higher education in Arthur W. Chickering and Associates, *The Modern American College* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981). This is an especially rich resource for anyone interested in the lives of faculty, although most of the essays focus on student development.

Especially important for the understanding of faculty as teachers and learners is the work of David Kolb. His article in the Chickering volume on "Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences" has proven to be illuminating in dealing with faculty, and his new book, *Experiential Learning: Experience as a Source of Learning and Development* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984), promises to aid in the understanding of much that is happening with faculty in mid-career. William Perry also has an article in the Chickering book. Lee L. Knefelkamp has applied Perry's work to faculty careers in "Faculty and Student Development in the 80s" (*Integrating Adult Development Theory with Higher Education Practice, Current Issues in Higher Education*, No. 5, AAHE, 1980). For our understanding of faculty, the usefulness of Perry's thought on cognitive development is only beginning to be appreciated.

Faculty Careers. The Faculty Vitality projects pay a great deal of at-

tention to the changing character of academic careers. Todd Furniss, *Reshaping Faculty Careers* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981) raises significant questions about "the traditional faculty career" (a chapter title) and urges a wide range of alternative approaches. The same theme is pressed by Roger Baldwin and others, *Expanding Faculty Options* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, 1981). Several of the projects included in the Foundation's grant series are described in this book.

There is much to be learned about academic careers through the examination of the research on other organizational careers. This recent research is presented in John Van Maanen, ed., *Organizational Careers: Some New Perspectives* (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1977), and C. Brooklyn Derr, ed., *Work, Family, and the Career* (New York: Praeger, 1980). Especially helpful is the work of Edgar Schein on career anchors, Lotte Bailyn's research on involvement and accommodation in work, and Michael Driver's theory of career concept types and organizational structure.

Rosabeth Kanter's work on opportunity structures and the uses of power in organizations is proving to be very useful in addressing the needs of faculty. She develops her ideas most fully in *Men and Women of the Corporation* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), and *Change Masters* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983). Kanter applies her analysis of organizational careers to faculty in "Career Growth and Organizational Power: Issues for Educational Management in the 1980s" (*Teachers' College Record*, 82 (4), Summer 1981, 553–66).

Others. Two other books deserve special attention. The first is William Nelsen, *Renewal of the Teacher Scholar* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1981). No one has looked more carefully at the attempts at faculty renewal in liberal arts colleges than Nelsen. He is now President of Augustana College (South Dakota) and is grappling directly with the problems. Finally, there is a very important book that addresses faculty development issues in a discipline. It is Charles A. Goldsmid and Everett K. Wilson, *Passing on Sociology: The Teaching of a Discipline* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1980). This book conveys the kind of enthusiasm for teaching and the sort of commitment to intellectual inquiry that will go a long way in maintaining vitality among faculty in any field.

OVERVIEW OF THE FOUNDATION'S HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

For nearly fifty years, the Northwest Area Foundation has supported educational projects in its eight-state funding region. Since 1973, most higher education grants approved by the Foundation Directors have been part of Foundation-initiated programs developed in response to identified needs.

An advisory committee of educators assists the Foundation staff in identifying priorities and reviewing proposals. The Foundation's Directors make all final decisions on programs and grants. Foundation-initiated programs are announced each year in Request for Proposals brochures.

Typically, programs are approved for a three- to five-year period. Individual higher education projects often receive support for more than one year. This is done for maximum impact and to increase the likelihood of program implementation and adoption by the institution. In accordance with the Foundation's general guidelines, grant funds are allocated to initiate innovative, new projects rather than to continue ongoing programs. No funds may be used for equipment, capital, or endowment support.

The first Foundation-initiated program in higher education focused on needs of independent colleges in the region. Under the Independent College Program, grants were made to improve admissions and retention, deferred giving, and, under the Project Examination series, to plan and implement new models of learning.

Project Examination, which supported activities over a five-year period, will test the impact of long-term Foundation support on curricular change. An evaluation of that series, prepared by Dr. Dora Marcus, Michigan State University, will be available in 1985. The Independent College Program that trained deferred gifts officers continues to be monitored, and a third Foundation publication on this topic will be published in 1985.

In 1978, the Faculty Vitality program was initiated by the Foundation. In the first year of the program, grants were awarded to individual institutions, while in the second year, consortiums of institutions received funding. In the same year, the Foundation initiated a program to balance career preparation and liberal learning. A report assessing the projects in that series of grants was issued in 1983.

For the past three years, the Foundation has supported projects that re-examine institutional mission or improve institutional efficiency or the teaching/learning process. In 1983, a program was launched to assist institutions address issues relating to the use of new technologies, primarily computers, in higher education. Another ongoing program encourages cooperative projects between elementary or secondary schools and colleges in the region. New grants will be awarded under these three programs in 1984–85.

The Foundation tries to remain responsive to the needs of the post-secondary institutions in its funding region. Foundation staff visits regularly with educators on campuses and in the Foundation's office. In addition to its grant programs, the Foundation hosts conferences and project directors' meetings on topics related to its interests. These activities, along with occasional publications, grow out of the Foundation's continuing concern for information sharing and faculty/staff development.

Northwest Area Foundation views education as a lifelong process. Quality, access, and faculty and institutional vitality in higher education are of strong interest to the Directors. The Foundation attempts to initiate programs that are pertinent to institutions of all sizes. In this current decade of shrinking resources, projects that demonstrate efficiency and cooperation are strongly encouraged.

The Foundation allocates approximately $1.5 million a year for higher education. Two- and four-year public and private institutions in the Foundation's funding region are eligible to apply for grants. Descriptions of project grants made in 1983 are available in the Foundation's current *Annual Report*. For further information on the Foundation's higher education activities, contact Martha G. Butt at the Foundation office.

The grant series supporting projects to foster faculty vitality was administered and monitored by Martha Butt, Vice President of the Foundation. R. Eugene Rice, Professor of Sociology, University of the Pacific, served as program evaluator and prepared this assessment of the grant series.

This report was edited by Vicki Itzkowitz, consultant to the Foundation, designed by Robert N. Taylor, and printed by Colwell/North Central Publishing Company of Saint Paul, Minnesota.

Copies of the Foundation's *Annual Report*, a periodic *Newsletter*, and the other program reports listed below may be obtained from the Foundation's office: West 975 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101-1373, (612) 224-9635.

The Deferred Gifts Program: Future Funding for Private Colleges
The Deferred Gifts Program II, 1974–1980
Northwest Gifted Projects
Strategies for Relating Career Preparation and Liberal Learning
Gifted Children: Nurturing a Resource, 1978–1982

Trustees:
Louis W. Hill, Jr.
Maud Hill Schroll
W. John Driscoll
Irving Clark
Sheila ffolliott

Directors and Officers:
W. John Driscoll, *Chairman of the Board and Treasurer*
Irving Clark, *First Vice Chairman of the Board*
Shirley M. Clark, Ph.D.
Joseph T. Ling, Ph.D.
Norman M. Lorentzsen
Carlos Luis
Francis B. Tiffany, M.D.
Jean M. West
Stanley E. Williams

Higher Education Advisory Committee,
Past and Present Members:
John Bevan, *Executive Director, Charleston Higher Education Consortium*
Paul L. Dressel, *Professor of University Research, Michigan State University*
Jon Fuller, *President, Great Lakes College Association*
Larry Jackson, *President, Lander College*
Phyllis Keller, *Associate Dean, Harvard University*
Edward A. Lindell, *President, Gustavus Adolphus College*
Kathryn Lyall, *Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin System*
Manning A. Pattillo, Jr., *President, Oglethorpe University*
Martha Peterson, *President Emeritus, Beloit College*
Charles J. Ping, *President, Ohio University*
Sister Joel Read, *President, Alverno College*
Marion L. Shane, *President, Mercyhurst College*
Joan Straumanis, *Associate Provost, Kenyon College*
Stephen J. Wright, *Vice President, College Entrance Examination Board*

Administration:
Terry T. Saario, *President, Secretary, and Assistant Treasurer*
Martha G. Butt, *Vice President and Assistant Secretary*
Judith K. Healey, *Vice President and Assistant Secretary*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE